LIBRARY OF PRINCE
MAY 23 191
THEOLOGICAL SEMIN

ARTICLES

ON THE

AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.

20

EXTRACTED FROM THE JULY AND OCTOBER NUMBERS OF
THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

LC564
.A5A7

Philadelphia:
PRINTED BY JAMES KAY, JUN. & CO.
LIBRARY STREET.
1829.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
5.23.11
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LC564
.A5A7

.A5A7

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 23 1911
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ARTICLES

ON THE

AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.

EXTRACTED FROM THE JULY AND OCTOBER NUMBERS OF
THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

Philadelphia:
PRINTED BY JAMES KAY, JUN. & CO.
LIBRARY STREET.
1829.

PREFACE.

As the intention has been publicly announced to print and circulate, in other forms than in the pages of the Biblical Repertory, the Examination, by Professor Stuart, of the article on the A. E. Society contained in the July number of that work, it becomes necessary that some means should be adopted to give the Reply to that Examination a more extended circulation. The subject discussed in these articles is so important that there would be an evident injustice in having one side of the question alone presented to the public. If Professor Stuart's Examination was to be confined to the Repertory, the reply would require no wider sphere of operation; but as the Examination is to be printed in other forms, the Reply must be printed in other forms also. There is no disposition to present an unfair or unsatisfactory view of this subject. Instead therefore of circulating only the articles against the A. E. Society, the friends of the views advocated in those articles, have deemed it most honourable to give in one view every thing that has yet been written on the subject. First, the Review of the A. E. Society, which appeared in the July number of this year; secondly, Professor Stuart's Examination of that Review; and thirdly, the Reply of the Editors to that Examination. The public may thus read and ponder the arguments for and against the system pursued by the A. E. Society, and judge for themselves.

Fully persuaded that this is a subject on which it is time for the churches to think and act, we feel it to be a duty to do all in our power to bring it before them in a way which shall secure their serious and prayerful attention. There is something more at stake here than party or sectarian interests, and we appeal therefore to far higher and purer principles. If there were nothing in the organization and principles of the A. E. Society but what seemed to militate against such partial interests, it would be a matter of comparatively small moment; but if the apprehensions entertained by many liberal men of all parties be well founded, the best interests of the church are involved in this discussion. No apology therefore need be given, under these circumstances, for bringing the arguments on both sides, in this form, before the Christian public.

THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S BOARD OF EDUCATION,

AND THE

AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.

by

James Carnahan

In the present aspect of the moral and religious world, there is something very peculiar, distinguishing it from any preceding period. Our world, in all ages, has presented a scene of wide spreading moral desolation, sufficient to call forth the sympathies and exertions of the Christian and Philanthropist. But obstacles, in the way of moral reformation, arising from the prejudices and political institutions of mankind, have existed, appalling to human reason and almost insuperable to the strongest faith in the divine promises. Since the days of the apostles, exertions, corresponding to the magnitude and importance of the object, have seldom been made by individuals, and never by the great body of professed Christians. And not unfrequently those whose hearts were engaged in the cause of God and man, have expended their strength and zeal in the use of means not sanctioned by the great head of the Church. When not groaning under the yoke of oppression, or bleeding beneath the sword of persecution, they have sought the patronage of the civil power, and endeavoured, by *carnal weapons*, to secure the victory, promised to be achieved only by *the sword of the Spirit*. The history of Christendom confirms the truth, that God will honour no means in extending and building up the kingdom of the Redeemer, except the voluntary exertions of his people in the use of those bloodless weapons, furnished in the Holy Scriptures; and that these are *mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.* Convinced by the fruitless attempts of past ages, that no reliance can safely be placed on the secular arm, Christians have been taught to look for the blessing of God on their own voluntary exertions. And if there are any so unapt to learn, as still to expect from the civil power any favour except protection and security in obeying the dictates of conscience, the fundamental principles of our government utterly exclude the most distant hope. We are reduced to the happy necessity of depending on God alone in the use of the appointed means for the fulfilment of his promises. The patronage afforded by other governments being thus removed, the Church is left to feel the full weight of her own responsibility; that on her unconstrained exertions depend the existence of a Christian ministry, the maintenance of public worship, and under God, the salvation of immortal souls. And we bless God that those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, have not been altogether insensible to the weight of obligation imposed by the circumstances in which they are placed. The various and successful operations of Christian benevolence, in the present day, furnish ample evidence that the gospel imparts to the heart an energy sufficient to sustain any enterprise required by the exigencies of the Church and of the world. It is true, nothing has yet been done commensurate to the spiritual wants of our own country, and much less of the world. But a spirit of Christian enterprise has been awakened, which we trust in God, will not rest, until the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God. Thus far, whenever spiritual wants have been ascertained, and fields of promising usefulness pointed out; the calls for pecuniary assistance have been answered with a promptitude and liberality, which leave no ground to fear the want of means to accomplish any future enterprise. A heart imbued with the spirit of the gospel, never can be insensible to the claims of a perishing world. As soon as it is known that the Bible is needed, and that the people are willing to receive it, money flows from innumerable channels into the treasury of the Lord. In like manner the means of supporting ministers of the gospel to an indefinite extent, may be obtained from those who need their ministrations, aided by the voluntary contributions of the more favoured portions of the Church. So numerous are the promising fields opening in our own vast territory, not to mention foreign countries, that labourers, sufficient to cultivate one half of the ground, cannot be obtained. Indeed, the operations of missionary societies are limited, not by the want of pecuniary means, but of competent and faithful men willing to endure privation and labour. A few years ago, when the first Theological Seminary was established in this country, the question was frequently asked, where will these young ministers find employment? Those already in that sacred office receive with difficulty a scanty subsistence. What will become of an additional number? Experience has shown how groundless are these apprehensions. Now, when these institutions have been multiplied ten-fold, the calls for ministerial labour are so numerous and pressing, that our young men are generally engaged before they have finished the prescribed course of study.

The Presbyteries connected with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, report between six and seven hundred congregations destitute of regular pastors. And we venture to affirm, that the churches of other denominations, are not, in proportion to their numbers, more fully supplied. The proportion of ministers, to the population of the United States, is every year rapidly diminishing. The tide of population is flowing to the west, to the north, and to the south; so that in less than one-fourth of a century, cultivated fields, flourishing villages and large cities, will occupy places now the abodes of wild beasts. These colonies, emigrating from Europe and the older states, carry with them the elements of social institutions and Christian churches. They not only receive with gratitude the Christian missionary who visits their new abode, but they send back from the wilderness repeated and earnest entreaties, to give them Bibles and ministers able to teach them to understand what they read. The American Bible Society has said that they shall have Bibles—and the Christian community is responding—means shall be furnished to redeem the pledge. Missionary societies are saying, we know where a thousand missionaries more than we can command, may be fully and usefully employed; and we know, also, where the means necessary for their support can be obtained. But men of suitable qualifications cannot be procured. Never did a field more extensive and promising present itself to the enterprise of the Christian community. The question is, shall it be left uncultivated until it be overspread with briars, and thorns, and thistles? Shall those who know the value of Christian privileges, and are willing, according to their means, to aid in obtaining them, be permitted to pass off the stage of action, and their children to grow up in ignorance and irreligion, before the heralds of the cross be sent to their assistance? Every one knows that the difficulty of instructing and reforming a people universally sunk in ignorance and vice, is an hundred-fold greater, than when a few are standing ready, at once, to take the minister of the gospel by the hand—to cheer him in his labours, and to aid him by their counsel, their influence, and their prayers. If our vast territory is ever to be filled with a Christian population, it is more economical to take possession, while we have in the bosom of the country, auxiliaries, than to gain possession after it falls, as is the certain consequence of delay, entirely into the hands of the enemy. Now only a part, hereafter the whole of the expense must be borne by the established churches. In the one case, the strength and resources of the Church would be increasing with the growth of the country. The churches formed, would aid in forming others. In case of present inaction, not only the relative, but the positive strength of the Church would diminish.—For in the moral, as well as the physical world, action is necessary, in order to retain the vigour already possessed. All this is admitted. *The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few.* Where shall we find men of a right spirit duly qualified for this work? What is to be done in the evident destitution of labourers necessary to collect and secure the abundant harvest now ready for the sickle? Our Master has given the answer—*Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.* This prayer has for ages been on the tongues of professed Christians, and is still repeated, whenever the wants of the Church and of the world come into remembrance. But is it accompanied with corresponding exertions? It is self-evident that to pray God to grant a particular blessing, when at the same time we neglect the use of means in our power, necessary to its attainment, is nothing less than solemn mockery. Earnestly to desire an object and not to raise a hand to receive it, when presented, is inconsistent with the invariable principles of human action. Could it be believed that a man, having the perfect use of his limbs, was really thirsty and desirous of a drink of cool water, when instead of going ten steps to a copious fountain, he would sit and beg that it might be conveyed to him by the immediate hand of the Almighty? We pray, and very justly, that the hungry may be fed, and the naked clothed, and yet if we do not minister to their wants according to our means, what advantage are our prayers to ourselves or to the needy? It is true, man cannot make ministers such as would be a blessing to the Church and the world. He cannot give them a new heart, and furnish them with the natural talents necessary to preach the gospel in a profitable manner. Therefore we must pray the Lord of the harvest, to send forth labourers into his harvest. But is there no human instrumentality to be employed in the conversion of those who are to be preachers of the gospel? Is there no human means to be used in training and preparing them when converted for that great work? It is admitted that God could, if it seemed good, take the ignorant and illiterate, and endow them with the gift of tongues, as he did a great part of the apostles, and make them the instruments of confounding the wisdom of the learned; or he could call those already educated with a view to secular professions, and inspire them with a knowledge of the mysteries of his kingdom, as he did the apostle Paul, and send them forth fully furnished to this great work. But this is not his ordinary mode of proceeding, as well in the kingdom of grace as of nature. God has provided in abundance, timber and stones, and every material suitable for the construction of houses,—but he has nowhere, or at any time, provided houses already built and furnished, without the intervention of human agency. We owe to God primarily our food and clothing, yet bread no where springs from the earth, nor garments grow on the trees precisely in the form suited to our use. A similar connexion between means and ends pervades the kingdom of grace. *Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent.* Now, if salvation be not attainable without this long series of means, how can men be sent to preach without any previous preparation?

At the introduction of Christianity, when miracles were necessary to prove the divine authority of the new religion, our Lord did not send forth illiterate Fishermen to preach the gospel, without previous instruction and preparation. They were with Him, who taught as never man taught, during the whole period of his personal ministry, they saw his miracles, heard his instructions, were witnesses of his death and resurrection, conversed with him forty days before his ascension, and finally, were endowed with the power of speaking more different languages than any minister of the present day can learn in a lifetime. Paul, previously furnished with all the learning and literature of his age and country, was called to the apostleship; and consecrating his high intellectual attainments to the service of his Lord and Master, he became one of the most able, as well as most zealous and successful ministers of the New Testament. To prove the necessity of a learned and able ministry in this country, where the advantages of education are general, and at this period, when every branch of literature and science is cultivated in a high degree, seems wholly superfluous. The experience of ages justifies the opinion now generally entertained by intelligent Christians of all denominations, that in a useful minister of the gospel, mental culture must be connected with ardent and devoted piety. How can a man not furnished with the necessary information, instruct others? Or if he have the requisite knowledge, he must *be apt to teach*, capable of communicating in plain and intelligible language, his thoughts and feelings. Language is usually acquired by imitation and practice. And it is a general rule in the administration of the divine government, not to bestow gratuitously that which may be acquired by human industry. A contrary mode of procedure would hold out an irresistible temptation to indolence and folly. The question then returns, how are ministers of the gospel, equal in number and in gifts to the exigencies of the Church, to be procured?—We repeat our Lord's answer—*Pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest.* Pray God to pour out his Holy Spirit on schools and colleges, and to convert and dispose young men, now in a course of education, to consecrate their talents and acquirements to the Lord—and let this prayer be accompanied with means suited to produce the effect. In the next place, let the Church take young men of promising talent, and hopeful piety, who are destitute of the means of obtaining a liberal education, and train them up for the service of the Lord. There are many such young men—the fruits of the refreshing influence which God has shed down in various places on the American Churches. This fact is a manifest proof, that the Lord of the harvest has heard prayer, has selected his labourers, and is waiting for the Church to do her duty, in educating the sons He has given her. In our country there are hundreds of young men distinguished for piety and talent, earnestly desirous to serve the Lord in any way he may direct, who are utterly excluded from the hope of obtaining a liberal education by their own resources, or those of their parents. What duty more obvious and pressing, than to educate these young men for future usefulness? They are the children of the Church, she needs their services, and she is bound to take them by the hand, to instruct them, and to direct their steps to a field where their labours are likely to be most conducive to her interest. To this case the general principle of political economy is not applicable; that where labour of any kind is in demand, men will, of their own accord, without artificial stimuli, prepare themselves for the occupation in which service is required. Because in the first place, the ordinary motives of interest do not, or ought not, to operate in the case before us. In this country the Church has no patronage from the civil government—no rich prebends to tempt the cupidity of parents in directing the education of their sons—no splendid livings independent on the will of the people, where the indolent incumbent is secure of his maintenance, in whatever manner he may perform the duties of his sacred office. Such also is happily the state of public sentiment, that the people will not long support a minister who is not active and laborious, manifesting a greater zeal for their spiritual interests than for his own private emolument. In these circumstances, when a gifted, and well educated young man, regards his own ease, or is ambitious of rising in the world, he usually turns his attention to some secular profession. And when we see a young man in independent circumstances, entering the gospel ministry, as is sometimes the case, we have strong presumptive evidence that he is governed by other motives than those of a worldly character. In the next place, many liberally educated young men lack piety; an essential and primary requisite in a useful minister. To introduce men destitute of piety into this sacred office, would be a curse, instead of a blessing to the Church, and to the world. If such men would answer, the cheaper and speedier way to supply the destitute with religious instruction, would be to raise the emoluments of the clergy. Then the same principle which preserves the equilibrium in secular employments, attracting labour where it is most needed and best rewarded, would operate, and we would have no cause to complain that the labourers were too few. Thus, where the Church is liberally patronized by the State, there is no lack of candidates for the gospel ministry. But such a state of things, when worldly-minded men, for the sake of filthy lucre, are induced to intrude themselves into the sacred office, is pestilence and death to the interests of moral reformation, and vital piety. If then, the Church would preserve her holy doctrines pure and unadulterated, if she would hold forth the word of life to the multitudes perishing around her, and provide for the spiritual wants of the rising generation, she must bring into her service; by a course of intellectual discipline, these young men, whose hearts God has prepared for the work, by the operations of His Spirit.

This is no new and untried experiment. It has been done in an unsystematic, and comparatively small way in the Presbyterian Church, for many years: and the result of the trial has been the most happy and encouraging. The mind of the Christian community seems now prepared to make a mighty and united effort, in this great cause on which every other Christian enterprise is evidently dependent.

While we are agreed respecting the importance of the object contemplated, we may, it is believed, honestly differ respecting the best mode of accomplishing it. Some years ago, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, appointed a Board of Education, to which the management of this concern was committed. We are not informed respecting the plan of operation adopted by the Board, nor of the precise extent of their labours. We know, in general, that nothing worthy the importance of the cause, nothing commensurate to the resources and wants of the Presbyterian Church, has been done. At the late sessions of the General Assembly, a proposition was made and adopted, to re-organize and enlarge the Board of Education, so that it might proceed with greater energy and effect in this important business. It remains yet to be determined whether any thing effective will result from the new arrangement. We know that many intelligent and influential members of the Presbyterian Church are anxiously waiting to see what steps will be taken. Their wishes and their feelings are in favour of the Assembly's Board, in preference to any other. But if nothing decided and effective be done the present year, they will be compelled, although with reluctance, to abandon all reliance on that Body, and to act singly, or to connect themselves with some other Society, pursuing the same object. Others think that the Assembly's Board of Education is wholly unnecessary; that the object in view may be attained more certainly and speedily, by the members of the Presbyterian Church, forming societies, auxiliary to the American Education Society. That Society, it is said, is perfectly organised, is in successful operation, has intelligent, zealous, and efficient agents, has collected large funds, and established a great number of scholarships, and has given a solemn public pledge that no young man of piety and talent in the United States, shall want the means of obtaining a thorough collegiate and theological education: and further, a large and efficient portion of the Presbyterian Church in the States of New York and New Jersey, now auxiliary to the American Education Society, is labouring harmoniously and successfully in the great cause. Why in these circumstances, is it asked, should an attempt be made to destroy unity of counsel and action, so essential to success, in every noble enterprize? Why distract the attention of the Churches, and diminish the amount of contributions, by applications from different Boards, for the same great object?

We admit, that there is something very magnanimous and captivating in the idea of a great society, laying aside sectarian names, collecting and disbursing funds in educating pious indigent young men for the gospel ministry, regardless of sect or party. We admit the energy and success of the American Education Society, that it has done more in exploring the spiritual wants of our country, in enlightening public sentiment on this subject, in pressing home on the consciences of Christians, the indispensable duty of engaging heart and hand in this mighty work, than has been done by all others. With unqualified pleasure, we admit also, that the concerns of this Society are managed by men in whose intelligence, piety, and energy, we have the highest confidence. Yet we are persuaded, after the fullest consideration we have been able to give the subject, that the Presbyterian Church, in her ecclesiastical capacity, ought to provide the means, and to direct the education of those who are to be her future ministers, not depending on others to do that which she is abundantly able to do herself. This may be done consistently with the kindest feelings, and best wishes towards others, who are seeking a similar object in a different way. That portion of the Presbyterian Church, now in no degree connected with the American Education Society, is a field sufficiently large to occupy the time and labour of one General Agent, and several assistants.

The American Education Society has now two Secretaries, or General Agents, constantly and laboriously employed, aided by the secretaries and agents of numerous auxiliaries. And if its operations be extended so as to meet the wants of the whole United States, the labour, and consequently the number of agents, must be vastly increased. The expense of agencies could not, therefore, be saved by a connexion with the American Education Society.

It is believed, also, that the charter of corporation of the Presbyterian Church is amply sufficient for the security and management of the necessary funds. Indeed, we can conceive of no possible advantage to be attained by an union with the National Society. And on the contrary, we think we see many appalling evils that would result from such an union.

To this conclusion, contrary to former partialities, we have been led by a recent examination of the fundamental principles of that Society, as well as by noticing, their practical effect, as far as time would permit their development. When the claims of the American Education Society were first presented, impressed with the importance of the object, without examining the bearings of its principles, we gave it our approbation, and feeble aid. A closer inspection of its peculiar features, has excited the most serious apprehensions that it may in the end injure the cause which it was designed to subserve.

We are constrained by a sense of duty, honestly to state our objections, and let the Christian community decide, whether or not they are well founded.

1. The details of expenses and receipts, of clothing, of

books, of donations from other societies and friends, of profits of teaching and labour, of debts contracted and paid, which young men, under the patronage of this society, are required to make every quarter, are unnecessarily and painfully minute. The design of this requirement is doubtless to guard against extravagance and imposition. These ends, it seems to us, might be attained in a less objectionable way. The committees of examination, or the teachers, under whose inspection the youth are, could judge of these matters with sufficient accuracy. And after all, if imposition be intended, a false report not easily detected might be made. The plan holds out a powerful temptation to conceal the amount of receipts and expenses, so as to form a stronger claim on the aid of the Society; placing the beneficiary in the attitude of a common beggar, whose success depends on the dolefulness of his story. Young men of delicate and ingenuous feelings, shrink from this public development of private and personal circumstances.

We know more than one young man of unquestionable piety, and of exemplary character, who cannot, for this reason, be persuaded to ask or accept the patronage of the American Education Society. We do not urge this objection, because it may be easily removed. We respectfully suggest it for the consideration of the Managers of that institution.

2. The principle of refunding the moneys advanced to young men patronized, is a doubtful, if not a dangerous feature in this institution. The reasons of introducing it seem to us more specious than solid. They are two: first to relieve the beneficiary from the mortification of being considered a *charity* student; and secondly, to augment the means and perpetuate the benefits of the society. We regret, exceedingly, that men of such high intelligence and exemplary piety, as the Directors of the American Education Society, should have deemed it necessary to form a screen to shelter those who are educated by the piety of the Church, from the unmerited reproach often attempted to be cast upon them. We might as justly say, that sons, educated at the expense of their parents, are charity students, because they defray no part of the expense themselves, and have no expectation of making a pecuniary recompense. The Church sustains a very near and sacred relation to all her members, and especially to the young. She is their

parent, their guardian, bound by the most sacred ties to give them spiritual nourishment and such an education as is suited to their capacity, and likely to be useful to the community of which they are members. On this high ground we would fix our standard, and let those, who please, hurl the shafts of ridicule and contempt. We would thus show the world that the Church is indeed one family, one body; that each member is the servant of the whole; and that the whole directs and aids the operations of each member. We would say farther, that a civil community, having a wise regard to its future necessities, educates some of its young citizens, in reference to a particular profession, which may be useful to the State. Look at our National Military School—the glory and defence of our country—there young men, the sons of the rich, as well as the poor, are educated free of expense. They are the adopted sons of their country, because they have talents which promise future usefulness. Look at our navy. Lads of fourteen or fifteen years of age, are appointed midshipmen, with pay sufficient for their support, when, for several years, they are incapable of rendering any essential service. In fact, they also are sent to school, free of expense; for they are placed in a situation, the best suited to prepare them for a particular profession. And, yet, in neither case, are bonds given to refund the money expended in their education. They are not even bound to serve in the profession for which they have been educated at public expense. And what is more, their prospects of wealth and distinction in future life, are as good as those of any other class of citizens. Now, what distinguishes a cadet, educated by his country, and a youth educated by the Church, that the one is stigmatized as a charity scholar, and the other is not? It is this single circumstance, and nothing more—the maintenance of the one is obtained by law, that is, by compulsion,—that of the other is voluntary, springing from the best feelings of the human heart.

The money advanced by the American Education Society is called a *loan,* a *parental loan.* But parents do not usually take bonds of their children, to refund the money expended in their education. They trust to their gratitude, their sense of moral obligation, that they will not permit the parent who has nurtured and educated them, to suffer want in old age; and this security is generally sufficient.

If a father bind a son with legal bonds, he, at the same time, cancels that of filial duty.

What, let us consider, for a moment, must be the effect on the future comfort and usefulness of the beneficiaries of these loans, which are to be repaid in *one*, *two*, and *three years after their preparatory studies for the ministry shall have been closed; with interest after the same shall have become due.* We ask any one acquainted with the state of the American Churches candidly to say, whether the worldly prospects in the gospel ministry are so flattering as to justify any young man of common prudence, in binding himself to pay five or six hundred dollars in three years after he becomes a pastor, from the salary he expects to receive? In a few cases, where a minister remains unmarried, expends nothing for books, and gives little or nothing to the numerous benevolent institutions which he must recommend to the liberality of his people, it may be done. But is this consistent with usefulness or duty, to consider the claims of the American Education Society, prior to all others?

We apprehend the tendency of this regulation will be, to create a calculating craving disposition, manifesting itself in every part of future life; or it is possible that a man of delicate feelings, seeing no prospect of relieving himself from this burden, may sink into despondency and inaction. The individual may also have other claims, equally sacred, resting upon him. As the sum afforded by the American Education Society is not sufficient to pay half the expense of an education in the cheapest college in the United States, he may have received aid from his parents or other friends, who, by a change of circumstances, have a stronger moral claim, than even the A. E. Society; and yet, if the Society chooses to make a demand, the written obligation must have the preference. It is true, the Directors have a discretionary power, and they have pledged themselves to exercise it in extraordinary cases; and we are persuaded, that the present Directors will never abuse their power; but we do not know who are to be their successors.

Some of our Colleges and Theological Seminaries have funds devoted to the education of young men, having in view the gospel ministry. Now, if these institutions aid the beneficiaries of the American Education Society, and take bonds of like tenor, the recipient of this double kindness must inevitably sink under the heavy pressure. And can the A. E. Society reasonably expect that these institutions will give their funds gratuitously to a young man, and permit him to bind himself with legal bonds to another corporation; so that he cannot, if his circumstances otherwise would permit, and his gratitude prompt him to do so, make any return to the source from which, perhaps, he received the most substantial assistance?

A young man under the patronage of the American Education Society, if he have no property of his own, must receive additional aid from some quarter; for it is not pretended that seventy or eighty dollars are sufficient to meet all his necessary annual expenses for clothing, boarding, books, tuition, fuel, lights. Now, if private associations, or Churches, or Presbyteries make up this additional sum, they in fact become auxiliary to the National Society, and throw gratuitously whatever they contribute into a stock, pledged to refund all that has been received through the hands of the parent society. And from what source, permit us to ask, are these funds to be ultimately derived? On the supposition that the young man has no property when he commences his ministry; that he does not in some unforeseen way become heir to an estate; that he does not engage in some lucrative secular employment, the means of refunding must come from the congregation which he serves. If the salary now paid to ministers be barely sufficient to support their families, it is evident an addition must be made, in order to liquidate the debt for which they are legally bound. Thus, every congregation, which shall call to the pastoral office a beneficiary of the A. E. Society, virtually becomes tributary to that corporation.

And what becomes of these moneys when refunded? The bond given by the beneficiaries shows that they go directly into the hands of the parent Society; and according to the constitution and rules of the Society, are entirely and absolutely under its control. The annual income of scholarships and donations are pledged to the auxiliaries, by whose means they were obtained, and are subject to their directions. But the moneys refunded by beneficiaries, are not thus pledged to the auxiliaries from whom they originally came. For example, suppose the Presbyterian Branch in New York educates an hundred young men, and after a few years one-half of them return what they have received, amounting to twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, the Branch in New York cannot, unless it be the good pleasure of the Parent Board, touch a cent of that money. Suppose farther, that all the Presbyterian Churches in the United States were to become auxiliary to the American Education Society, the moneys refunded by all their beneficiaries, as well as their annual surplus, must go to the Parent Board, and be entirely beyond the reach of the Branches. Add these moneys refunded to the permanent funds and scholarships intrusted to the immediate care of the Parent Society, and it seems to us that if this process were to go on for half a century, a height of independence must be attained, sufficient to make even good men's heads turn giddy. From the very constitution of the society, whose claims to universal patronage we have presumed to examine, it must every year be growing more and more independent, not only of the original contributors, but also of the auxiliaries; and it must also be acquiring a more extensive influence over the ministers of the gospel in the United States. Let us suppose that some twenty or thirty years hence, one half of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church shall have been educated under this system, and that the bonds of many of them remain unpaid in the hands of the Directors in the vicinity of Boston, and that in these circumstances a proposition were made in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, to change some important feature in her discipline or doctrines, and that the Directors of the American Education Society were known to think favourably of these changes—what would be the consequence? We all know how wonderfully interest influences the opinions even of good men, and how prone they are to coincide in sentiment with those on whom they are dependent.

We are far from intimating that any such influence is now intended to be attained, and if it were attained, that it would be improperly used. We have the happiness to be personally acquainted with some of the Directors of this great concern, and we know the reputation of all; and we believe them to be as pure in their intentions, as single in their purpose, and as devoted to the cause of evangelical piety, as any men on earth; and we disclaim any knowledge of a single act in their management of this great charity which has the most remote sectarian bearing. But the confidence justly reposed in their integrity, has a tendency to throw into their hands unlimited power; and this power will be delivered to their successors, and from the nature of the case, will be a rich blessing, or a tremendous curse to posterity. What security have we, that this mighty engine of life or death, of salvation or perdition, will for half a century remain in the hands of men possessing the same spirit? We answer, none, except the integrity and prudence of frail man. The promise of God assures us that he will always have a Church. But whether the descendants of this family or that family, the successors in this corporation or that corporation, shall maintain the pure doctrines of the gospel, and feel their power, we know not.

3. The first article in the constitution of the American Education Society, defining the manner of obtaining membership, connected with the second, authorizing the Directors to form a permanent fund of "bequests, legacies, donations, and grants, thus appropriated by the donors," and of any other property of the Society, at pleasure, we consider very liable to abuse, and highly dangerous. The first article is as follows: viz. "Any person who shall subscribe, and shall pay into the treasury at one time, one hundred dollars, or if a clergyman, forty dollars, shall be an honorary member; and shall have a right to sit and deliberate in all meetings of the Society. But all members hereafter added to the Society *who shall be entitled to vote, shall be chosen by ballot*, at an annual meeting."

To this article, we should have no material objection, if it were not connected with permanent funds of an indefinite amount; because there would be little or no temptation to abuse; but as it is so connected, it appears truly alarming. We are disposed to attribute the origin of this article to the best motives; to suppose (for we have no knowledge of the fact) it was intended, by giving the present members the power of choosing their successors, to prevent the management of the Society from passing into unfaithful hands. Whatever may be the effect of this arrangement in preventing or retarding the perversion of the funds from the original purpose, it certainly increases the power of the Officers and Directors to an almost unlimited extent. It enables them, if so disposed, to select the persons who are to vote in choosing Officers and Directors; so that in fact they might as well be elected for life, with the power of nominating their own successors. Suppose that at any time a majority of the acting members of the Society are in favour of the measures adopted by the Directors, the Directors can, through their friends, have new voting members chosen, favourable to the same course; so that it will in the end amount to the same thing, as to give the Directors the power of appointing their successors. The distant members, who have a right to vote, can seldom attend the anniversaries; so that from the nature of the case, the election of officers and new members, can always be under the control of those residing near the place of holding the annual meetings.* If at any time, the concerns of the Society should be mismanaged, it is evident from the very terms of the compact, that the branches and distant contributors, have no means of effecting a reformation; because they have voluntarily surrendered their rights into the hands of a body politic in the State of Massachusetts. And as this corporation can hold real estate, whose annual income shall equal ten thousand dollars; can increase permanent funds, and scholarships, to any extent; can dispose at pleasure of the annual surplus of the auxiliaries, and the moneys returned by beneficiaries, and has also a veto on the appropriations of the branches; its power must become immense*. And the organization is so adjusted, the machinery is so admirably arranged as to concentrate the whole power in a single point; so that the hand of an infant, touching a lever in Boston, can control, and manage, and direct the whole Christian community, south and west of the Connecticut, interested in this concern.

As long as the Directors remain, such as we believe they now are, intelligent, active, and devoted to the cause of evangelical doctrine and vital piety, every thing, which the interests of the Church and of the world demand, will be done. But if the fountain should by any means become corrupt; if the mighty reservoir, whose streams are intended to pervade and refresh, and fertilize every part of our vast territory, and even to flow to Africa and Asia, and regions yet unexplored, should be poisoned, how shall its deadly overflowings be checked; what antidote can be cast in to restore the salubrity of the waters? No human power or human skill, it seems to us, can be of any avail; because no external force can touch the internal spring which moves the whole machine. Let the American Education Society proceed as it has commenced; let it accumulate in its own hands all the funds destined for the education of pious, indigent young men, and then the character and qualification of a large portion of the ministers of the gospel in the United States, will be suspended on the piety and integrity of a few men located in the same vicinity. Every man, and every corporation, think power to be safe in their own hands. But who can guaranty that no change will take place in the sentiments and character of the next, or succeeding generation? It may happen, (for it has often happened,) that one man of talents and influence, may change the religious views and feelings of a whole neighbourhood or city. If such a change should take place in the Board of Directors, how shall the sacred funds of the American Education Society be snatched from their grasp? The danger of committing permanent funds of a large amount into the hands of bodies politic, from the frequency of perversion, has become proverbial. No guards or precautions, heretofore invented, have been found effectual. And what security, not previously tried in vain, is given in the case before us? We say, none. The power is in the hands of a few men, not responsible to the donors nor to the Christian community at large, responsible only to the voting members of the Society, whom they can create at pleasure. The security is even less than what has repeatedly been ineffectual. Funds devoted to sacred uses, and guarded with creeds and formularies, and subscriptions, have been perverted from the object of the pious donors; and that, too, when those into whose hands they originally came, were men of incorruptible integrity and ardent piety. We could appeal to a well known instance, in the vicinity of Boston. Can it be a doubtful question, whether the funds belonging to the Hollis Professorship in Harvard University, are now used for a purpose totally at variance with the intention of the original founder? Who could have thought fifty years ago, that so entire a change would have taken place in the sentiments of those who manage the concerns of that venerable and splendidly endowed institution?

---

* See Rules, Chapter vi. 9.

Piety and talents are the only qualifications prescribed in the charter and constitution, to limit the appropriation of the funds belonging to the American Education Society. Admitting that genuine piety is one of the best religious tests that can be proposed; yet the opinions of men are so various respecting it, that this qualification cannot possibly be any restraint to a corporation, wishing to introduce into the ministry, young men hostile to the fundamental principles and spirit of the gospel. We would confide in the judgment of the present Directors, and also of their examining committees, as far as they are known, yet we must again repeat,—we know not who are to be their successors.

As this institution is intended to "*continue for generations and ages to come*," and as consequences the most tremendous, that can be conceived, must follow from a perversion from its original design, it becomes us to examine well the foundation on which its security from abuse rests. We ought not to be dazzled with its wonderful success and the good which it has already achieved, so as to lose sight of remote consequences. We should recollect the profound remark of the Roman Senator, *Omnia mala exempla ex bonis initiis orta sunt.* Nations never voluntarily resign their liberties into the hands of a known tyrant. They must be dazzled with the splendour of foreign victories—They must see the spoils of conquered cities brought home in his triumphant chariot—They must share in the corn and the wine he distributes in profusion—and then they will hail him as their master, and bind themselves with chains, which neither they nor their children's children can burst asunder. Religious vassalage is commenced and consummated in the same manner. An open and confessed heretic seldom begins the work of corruption; but he succeeds to the confidence and power acquired by some zealous and faithful servant of the Lord Jesus, and then he employs the authority with which he is invested in spreading around him moral pestilence and death. Men of corrupt principles have not usually zeal enough to commence a religious charity, or liberality enough to contribute the necessary funds: but when the funds are collected, they see an object sufficient to excite their ambition, and they are not deficient in expedients to gain the management and control of what men of a different spirit have accumulated. Suppose such an event should happen in regard to the American Education Society—it is not more unlikely than some things that have occurred in the same vicinity not fifty years ago—and then all the power and resources now lodged in the hands of the present gifted and eminently devoted Secretary, and of his equally distinguished counsellors, would be brought to bear against the cause of evangelical doctrine and vital piety. It would remain for the friends of gospel principles, stripped of the means provided by their pious predecessors, to weep and pray in secret. They must again retreat to the mountains and retired valleys, recruit and discipline their forces, and again come forth and meet an enemy formidable in numbers, insolent with victory, and clad in burnished armour recently seized by stratagem.

For reasons similar to these stated, there are many intelligent and influential men belonging to the Presbyterian Church, who cannot connect themselves with the fortunes of the A. E. Society. They see and feel the importance of the general object, but they dread the dangers to which they conceive this institution is exposed. They dislike also, the negligence and want of energy which have hitherto characterized the proceedings of the General Assembly's Board of Education, and they are now waiting with anxious and prayerful interest the result of the new organization. It is believed the Churches are ready to sustain the exertions of the Board, if an active, intelligent, and faithful agent would lay before them the want of able and well furnished ministers in the Presbyterian Church. And if there be evils and dangers connected with the operations of the A. E. Society, (as we verily believe there are,) they are not to be corrected and averted by finding fault and complaining, but by immediate and spirited exertion. The work to be done is important and urgent. Those who love our Lord Jesus Christ, will not listen with indifference to the calls for ministers of the Gospel, by whatever agent they are communicated. And if a channel for their liberality, such as they would prefer, be not speedily opened, it will flow in some other way.

Perhaps it may be asked, whether funds in the hands of the Board of Education will not be liable to the same abuse dreaded in the hands of the A. E. Society. We answer, No. First, because if young men be educated by the Presbyterian Church, they will not be under the influence of a foreign institution, and in the deliberations of her judicatories, they will be at liberty in all matters to decide according to the dictates of their own judgment and conscience, unawed by the frowns of a displeased creditor. In the next place the General Assembly which appoints the Board of education is not a permanent and fixed body. It does not elect its own members. It is annually dissolved, and a new Assembly is chosen by the Presbyteries in various parts of the

United States, each member expressing the views and wishes of the Churches he represents, and accountable for every vote he gives. For this reason it is impossible that funds deposited in the hands of the Assembly for a sacred purpose, can be perverted from their original object, until the whole Church, or at least a large majority of the Presbyteries become corrupt. And if permanent funds for religious purposes be secure from perversion any where, it is under the management of a body thus constituted. And further, business is not conducted in the General Assembly in the same manner as in the annual meetings of voluntary associations. Here the reports of different Boards are read, and submitted to a rigid examination. All their plans and acts are canvassed, and if any thing be radically wrong, it is competent to the Assembly to change the members of the Board. In the annual meetings of the other, there is, strictly speaking, no deliberation or examination of the measures pursued. The report of the Directors is read, eulogies prepared for the occasion, are pronounced, and a vote of approbation passed by acclamation. There is, in reality, no meeting of the contributors, nor of their representatives, but only of the voting members chosen by those who had the previous management of the concern, drilled to respond Aye or No, as they may have been previously instructed. We do not say any thing like this has taken place. Our perfect confidence in the integrity of the Directors, forbids the slightest suspicion. Our meaning is, that there is nothing in the constitution, or in the manner of conducting the annual meetings calculated to prevent it. We have discharged an important, and in some respects an unpleasant duty. We had long noticed things in the arrangements of the American Education Society which seemed strange and novel; but so full was our persuasion of the importance of the sacred cause, in which it was labouring, that we did not dare permit ourselves to think there was any error. A closer examination of the constitution and rules, has convinced us that so imminent are the dangers connected with the operations of that Society, it would be treason to the cause of piety, any longer to be silent. We have not designedly distorted a single feature of the great Society whose claims to universal patronage we have canvassed. And we most devoutly pray God, that none of the evils anticipated may ever happen, that the exertions of the Society, in a cause so noble and sacred, may be a rich and lasting blessing to the Church and to the world.

EXAMINATION

OF THE

REVIEW OF THE AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.

Moses Stuart

To the Editors of the Biblical Repertory;

Messrs. Editors,—In the third number of the new series of your Work, dated July, 1829, I have met with a piece, on the General Assembly's Board of Education, and the American Education Society, which has deeply interested my feelings. Whoever the writer of that piece may be, I take the liberty to tender him my most sincere and hearty thanks for the very valuable considerations which he has suggested, at the commencement of his Strictures, respecting the present aspect of the moral and religious world, and the duties and obligations of Christians which result from it. I do most entirely concur with all his remarks, respecting the past failure of the churches to perform their duty in regard to spreading the knowledge of the Gospel abroad; and in regard to their error in seeking, at any time, to sustain themselves by leaning on the arm of civil power. For one, I rejoice that God has taught them so instructive lessons on this subject; for we may now venture to hope, in this country at least, that she will not again seek for help from a quarter which will never afford it; and which, if at any time it condescends to put on the appearance of affording it, exacts more as a return for its favours, than conscience can allow, or the interests of religion permit without injury.

The picture of the religious wants of our country; the calls for pastoral labours, from thousands of places that are destitute of the word of life; the interest which Christians are taking in this subject; the importance of *immediately* furnishing our new settlements with faithful spiritual guides; the necessity of having these well instructed and disciplined for their great work; and the imperious duty of all Christians, who are praying the Lord of the harvest to send forth more labourers, to be active in furnishing all the means of training up such labourers; are drawn, described, and urged in a manner which satisfies the most ardent feelings and wishes of my heart. I fully concur with the writer, also, in the directions which he gives, as to the manner in which our spiritual wants are to be supplied. It is true that our first duty is, to raise our humble and earnest cries to the Great Lord of the harvest, that he would multiply the number of labourers; and equally true, that the Christian church is under the highest obligations, while she prays for this, to do all in her power to promote it, by taking pious and indigent youth under her care, and providing for their education in an adequate manner.

With the writer I do also sympathise most entirely, on the subject of beneficed livings in the church. If a graceless ministry is to be raised up; if the church is to be thronged with aspirants after her favours, whose hearts are rankling with enmity at the strictness of her principles, and filled to overflowing with insatiable desires after worldly and sensual pleasures; then let her provide livings which will afford the means of ease and luxury. She will thus hold up a premium to men of secular views who are desirous of enjoying these; and will never fail to have at least as many ministers, as she has benefices to bestow upon them.

In view of the deadly evil which such a course has occasioned in other countries, it seems to be the plain duty of all sincere Christians in ours, to pray that the clergy may always continue to have very moderate incomes; to see to it that they never can become rich; at least never become so, by means of what the church bestows upon them in the way of salary. In respect to the usefulness of ministers of the Gospel, I can truly say, that their poverty appears to be great matter of congratulation. None but the most prejudiced and bigoted opposers of religion can now accuse them of selfish and pecuniary views, in choosing the ministry for a profession. There is scarcely a salary in this country, at least among the Presbyterian and Congregational churches, which could be the object of ambition to any man of a worldly spirit, and of talents above mediocrity.

It would give me much pleasure if I could proceed through the whole piece, on which I have commenced making remarks, and find nothing which I could not sincerely commend, and with which I do not fully agree. But when the writer comes to make his remarks on the principles and proceedings of the A. E. Society, I am constrained to differ from him, and to cherish views materially diverse from those which he has disclosed.

I take it for granted, that a man of such an able mind and excellent spirit, as is developed in that part of the piece on which I have been remarking, will very readily concede to others the liberty which he has himself taken in the free remarks which he has made on the principles and proceedings of the A. E. Society. He will cheerfully grant me the privilege of examining the facts and principles which he has brought forward, by way of supporting his objections to the Society in question; first, because he himself wishes only to come at a correct view of the whole ground, and to know what can be said in its defence, as well as against it; and, secondly, because the public, who have now had one side of the question placed before them, are entitled to know what answer the friends of the A. E. Society have to make to the allegations there produced against their measures.

I enter with much reluctance on this task. It is always unpleasant to entertain, or to express differences of opinion, when these differences have respect to men for whom we cherish a high and Christian regard. It is an unwelcome task, also, to come before the Christian public in a kind of polemic attitude. Many Christians shrink instinctively from every thing which looks like dispute. The world are very ready to speak with exultation, on what they are pleased to call the *quarrels* of the church. Distrust, unkind feeling, alienation, coldness, or suspicion, are very apt to creep in, while the professed disciples of Christ are engaged in discussion, (not to say *dispute;*) and especially is this the case, when discussion grows animated, and the cause stands committed before the world.

On all these accounts, I advance to the task before me with undissembled reluctance; fearing lest the declaration of opposing sentiments, or the correction of mistaken facts, may possibly be understood by some as an exhibition of feelings which are unfriendly, or as a manifestation of party spirit, which, reckless of truth, or union, or peace, seeks to defend its own views at all adventures.

I cast myself, therefore, after these remarks, on the generosity of the writer in question, and that of his friends who sympathize with him; trusting, that while I endeavour strictly and faithfully to examine the allegations made respecting the A. E. Society, they will not do me the injustice to believe, that I have any *personal* motives in view, or am seeking the interests of any supposed party in that quarter of the country to which I belong.

I am indeed, a friend of the A. E. Society; and I have been so from its very rise. But it is not because I have been in any way connected with it, or have ever received, or expect to receive, any direct benefit from it; nor am I in any way responsible for its measures.

It is true, that having lived near the centre of the Society's operations, and having an intimate acquaintance with all who are actually concerned in the immediate and principal management of its interests, I have been, from the very first, acquainted with its principles, measures, and proceedings. From a sincere approbation of these, I can subscribe most heartily to the noble and generous concession, which the Reviewer of their proceedings makes, page 354, and which I beg permission here to quote.

" We admit, that there is something very magnanimous and captivating in the idea of a great Society, laying aside sectarian names, collecting and disbursing funds in educating pious indigent young men for the Gospel ministry, regardless of sect or party. We admit the energy and success of the A. E. Society, that it has done more in exploring the wants of our country, in enlightening public sentiment on this subject, in pressing home on the consciences of Christians, the indispensable duty of engaging heart and hand in this mighty work, than has been done by all others. With unqualified pleasure, we admit also, that the concerns of this Society are managed by men in whose intelligence, piety, and energy, we have the highest confidence."

Agreeing most fully with this writer, in his views of the men to whom the management of the A. E. Society is entrusted; and cherishing these views, after having for a score of years been intimately acquainted with almost all of them, and with the remainder ever since they have come upon the stage of action; I acknowledge that it is not without some degree of pain and reluctance, that I perceive the measures they have taken are virtually called in question, and our country is warned against the dangers to which they are thought to be exposing it.

But it becomes their friends, and therefore myself among them, to examine the charges preferred against their principles and proceedings with impartiality, and to listen to every sober and friendly suggestion which may be made by any, who are disposed to call in question the wisdom or the correctness of their measures.

I have endeavoured to do this. The result I beg leave to communicate in the following order; viz.

I. I shall examine the *facts* alleged, in regard to the measures and principles of the A. E. Society.

II. I shall make some remarks on the *fears* which are expressed with respect to it. And,

III. I shall briefly consider the *method* which the Reviewer has chosen, in order to accomplish his object.

In examining the *facts* alleged by the Reviewer, I shall proceed in the order in which he has presented them. It is my design to leave no material circumstance out of view; for on a question of so great importance as the present, the public are entitled to information minute and circumstantial enough to lead them fully to make up their opinions.

The first allegation of the Reviewer is, that "the details of the expenses and receipts of clothing, of books, of donations from other societies and friends, of profits of teaching and labour, of debts contracted and paid, which young men under the patronage of the Society are required to make every quarter, are unnecessarily and painfully minute," p. 356. The chief grounds of this objection are, "that the plan holds out a powerful temptation to the beneficiary, to conceal the amount of receipts and expenses, so as to form a stronger claim on the aid of the Society;" and that "it places him in the attitude of a common beggar, whose success depends on the dolefulness of his story." "Young men of delicate and ingenuous feelings," it is averred, "shrink from this public development of private and personal circumstances." p. 15.

On this subject, I would remark, that the detail required of beneficiaries in Academies and Colleges, and which are in some respects more minute than those required of theological Students, may be summed up in general, under the following heads, viz. Stage of duty; number of weeks engaged in study during the quarter; price of board, with its amount; tuition; expenses for washing, room, fuel, lights, and also for books and stationary; incidental expenses; debts at the beginning of the quarter, exclusive of those due to the A. E. Society; receipts from the Society during the quarter; receipts from any other source, either of money, or of clothes or books; the number of weeks in which the beneficiary has been engaged in teaching school during the quarter, with the receipts for the same; receipts for labour in any other way; together with a general summary, at the close, of the whole debts due, exclusive of those due to the A. E. Society. The applicant subscribes, also, a declaration of his intention to devote his life to the ministry of the Gospel, and he asserts that he solicits patronage for this end.

Printed schedules of all the items are furnished for the use of the beneficiary, who makes his returns under each head. This is handed by him to the Principal of the Academy or College with which he is connected, who examines it as minutely as he pleases; then certifies his belief as to the correctness of it. In addition to this, he certifies that the beneficiary in question sustains, in all respects, such a character as is required by the Constitution and Rules of the A. E. Society, in order to receive their aid. This is forwarded every quarter to the directors of the Society; and on these is predicated their vote in relation to the aid that is sought for. Where the distance of the School or College is very great, however, it is forwarded only once in six months.

Such are the *facts*, in relation to the details in question. Let me now make some remarks on these facts, and the proper tendency of them.

1. It is obvious, that as the Society is called upon to aid those *who stand in need of aid*, and as it was instituted solely for this purpose; so it can, with fidelity to its trust, bestow aid only on such as afford *adequate and satisfactory evidence of such need*. But how is this evidence to be obtained? The answer is, By a knowledge of the character and entire pecuniary circumstances of the individuals who apply for aid. If they are themselves indigent, but have

friends able to assist them, and liberal enough to do it; if they are able to obtain money enough to help themselves, by any personal efforts which they can make at labour or otherwise, consistently with honesty and integrity of character; then they do not need the aid of the Society. On the other hand, if they are in debt; if they have no friends of the character described; if they fail in the means of aiding themselves in an adequate manner; then it is plain, that they need the assistance of the Society. If moreover, they are prodigal, or excessive in their expenses for clothing, in the purchase of books, in their incidental expenses, or in their room rents, or in any thing of the like nature, it is the proper business of the Society to know this. It is impossible to judge whether they are the *deserving* subjects of aid, unless all these facts are examined.

I would ask the Reviewer to point out a single article in the Schedule of the student's returns, which is not concerned with an estimate either of his *pecuniary condition* or of his *character*. If this cannot be done, (and I venture to say it cannot,) then does it follow, of course, that the Society have only taken means for information, which their duty and fidelity to their trust oblige them to take. There is not a single item here, which any honest and ingenuous youth should ever be ashamed or afraid to disclose. That he is poor, is no ground of reproach. I had almost, said it is the contrary. That the whole extent of his indigence should be known to those who are to aid him, is a matter of as plain equity and propriety, as that a man who borrows money of his friend, should not conceal from him his true pecuniary condition. The most open, honest, and ingenuous proceeding, in all such cases, is to keep nothing back which can throw any light on the real circumstances of the case. The Reviewer thinks that the Committee of examination, or the teachers under whose inspection the youth are, could judge of these matters with sufficient accuracy. But without attempting to show that the same amount of information never could be obtained in this manner, with uniformity and correctness; it may be asked, if it be not incumbent on those whom the community have made *responsible* for the distribution of funds, to know and judge for themselves, as far as they may, whether those whom they aid are in real need of assistance? Upon the present plan, both Instructors and Directors are supplied with the means of forming an opinion on this subject; dispense with it, and there is no certainty that either will be regularly and thoroughly made acquainted with the facts, upon which such an opinion should rest.

2. Returns of such a nature as those in question, are of serious benefit to the individuals concerned.

Need it be proved anew to the world, that the virtues of industry, frugality, regularity of life, and caution as to unnecessary and injudicious expenses, are best taught in a *practical* way? What can all the preaching in the world do at Colleges, Academies, or any where else, while young men and boys have their pockets filled with money which is at their own disposal? The most weighty and well enforced precepts, the most attractive examples, exert but little influence in such cases. Every Instructor in any Seminary of learning in our country, will confirm this statement.

What then is to be done? What measures will effectually teach young men to enter on life, with frugality, with industry, with a judicious and uniform foresight in regard to all their pecuniary responsibilities and embarrassments? I answer; Let them set out from the very first, as soon as they are able to take care of themselves, with a responsibility for doing so; with a responsibility too, which will amount to something; which will be felt in all their measures, and will have a controlling influence over them so as to make them guarded, and sober. The responsibility to parents of most young men educated in public, for the manner in which they spend money and time, is but little felt, and is in most cases made so light, as to afford no serious obstacle in the way of their extravagance and profusion. A frown or two when bills are presented, which are large beyond propriety; a murmur at the unexpected amount of them, and a kind of half serious, half joking complaint of extravagance; constitute the weight of the penalty on the part of the parents, which most youth have actually to suffer for extravagance and idleness: and the responsibility to a tribunal which inflicts only such a punishment, is but little dreaded, and has therefore but little influence on such as are disposed to be extravagant.

How different the condition of a youth, whose character, whose prospects, whose success, whose all, depends on the strictness of his discipline, and the rigid watch which he keeps over all his powers and passions of body and mind! I appeal to *facts*. From what class of youth do our most shining characters in Church and State spring? From the children of the rich, or of the poor? Almost exclusively from the latter. Debauchees, and profligates, and blockheads abound among the children of the rich; while among the poor in our Seminaries, characters of this sort are far more rare.

I have been intimately connected with the instruction of youth, for more than thirty years; and I have very often been led to believe, that the greatest misfortune which can befall a youth endowed by nature with promising talents, is, that his parents should be rich. The failure in some respect or other, as to the requisite strictness of discipline in such a case, is almost certain, in a great majority of instances. But the beneficiary of the A. E. Society has a powerful stimulus acting constantly upon him, and operating to produce habits of sobriety, and frugality, and industry; habits on which depend, in a great measure, his prospects of usefulness and success in life.

I feel the more certain of all this, because, of the numerous young men aided by benevolent Societies with whom I have been intimately acquainted I have observed some, who have been aided only in the way which the Reviewer would prefer, that have evidently been injured as to their habits of economy and feeling. With the conviction that the treasury of their benefactors would not be closed against them, unless they should exhibit some palpable acts of extravagance, they have felt that a nice attention to frugality was unnecessary. The fact also that they had been taken up as it were in their infancy, and dandled in the lap of more than parental kindness, contributed to inspire them with exalted ideas of their own talents and deserts. They did not seem to me so much to accept of charity in the way of a gratuity, as to claim it as a debt. Nay, one might well say, who knew the whole development of their feelings, that they regarded the church as *debtors* to them on account of their high importance to her, and of their elevated worth; and that they really deemed it a matter of condescension on their part, to accept of what was gratuitously proffered to them.

Yes, I have seen this; and my soul has sickened at the sight. The blasting influence of such a state of feeling on the Christian character of youth intended for the ministry, is self-evident; and it is my heart's desire and prayer to

God, that the Church may keep as clear from presenting such a temptation, as the accomplishment of the great ends which she has in view will permit her to do.

It is plain beyond all doubt, that young men who are to be ministers of the Gospel need to be educated in habits of frugality; in which condition, it is absolutely certain that their salary, in any ordinary case, will never be adequate without the strictest economy, to their wants. How many pastors are every year dismissed, how many inflict deep distresses on themselves, and on their families, for want of early discipline like that which the A. E. Society requires, unhappy experience daily testifies. It is my full belief, that the Alumni of the A. E. Society will present fewer cases of such melancholy facts, than have heretofore been usual.

I am aware of the objection which has been made, and which the Reviewer hints at under another head, viz. that a mode of educating young men subjected to so many restraints, will make them niggardly and covetous. But I am not prepared to believe, that attention to frugality, and industry; strict attention to all one's pecuniary responsibilities and expenditures, so necessary in all the business of life, and so much applauded by all men; can have any proper tendency towards the vices of covetousness and pusillanimity. Beyond a few instances in which men love money merely for its own sake, covetousness, rapacity, extortion, and niggardliness, belong mostly to those who are greedy to obtain something to lay out on the means of sensual pleasure or of gratifying some ambitious desire. In a word, I confess myself exceedingly slow to believe, that the God of nature has so formed us, that the insisting on the practice of certain virtues, should in itself have a tendency to lead to certain vices. Facts disprove this. Of all the classes of men in society, I know of none more liberal, more kind, more generous hearted in proportion to their means, than such as have been the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society. Nay, I can say more; I can say that their purses, light as they are, with scarcely sufficient to pay their letter postages, and to purchase enough of stationary to write to their friends, are opened to the calls of charity and religion; and the simple mites bestowed with such views and such a spirit, I trust will prove to be, in the Saviour's estimation, like the widow's mite cast into the treasury of God in the view of the astonished disciples.

3. I must add to the considerations already suggested, that an accountability like the one in question, is absolutely necessary to secure the confidence of the community, and particularly of men of business, who are accustomed to responsibilities.

The experience of the A. E. Society determines, that those who are able and willing to give, will not do so to any great extent, and certainly will not continue to do so for any length of time, unless a high responsibility is created on the part of those who are to receive their bounty.

The allegation of the Reviewer against such a measure, is the first and only serious one of this kind, which the Directors have ever heard. With one consent, the community, so far as I have any knowledge, have applauded their measures on this point. Nay, of the hundreds of young men on their list, no one has as yet, so far as they know, ever raised his voice against the measure, or made complaint of its oppressive nature. So far have they been from this, that they have often testified their most hearty concurrence and approbation.

If the A. E. Society are wrong, then, in respect to the measure in question, the whole community, givers and receivers, are wrong along with them. All men of business, especially, are fundamentally in error; for it is from these in particular, that the high and imperative demand has come, that the society should create the utmost responsibility which is fairly in its power. They demand all the security which from the nature of the case can be afforded, that their bounty will not be squandered or misapplied. That they are in the right, I do most heartily believe; and that the American public will justify this view of the subject, and support it, I am fully persuaded.

4. I may remark, in the last place, that the Schedule of returns under discussion, is very important to the Directors of the A. E. Society, in as much as it furnishes them with a large number of *facts*, which must serve as the basis of many of their calculations and their measures.

The average amounts of expenses are made out from such statements. The probable and possible means of helping themselves by labour, or otherwise which young men possess, comes in this way to be known. The comparative expenses in different parts of the country are developed. In this way the Directors come to the knowledge of facts, which serve to meet assertions like that of the Reviewer, when he says, that "the aid afforded by the A. E. Society is not sufficient to pay half the expense of an education in the cheapest College in the United States." The answer to this is, that it does not comport with *facts* thus disclosed.

I must not quit the topic under discussion, without noticing the two great difficulties which the Reviewer suggests, as standing in the way of the requisitions in question.

In his view, "The plan holds out a powerful temptation to conceal the amount of receipts and expenses, so as to form a stronger claim on the aid of the Society; placing the beneficiary in the attitude of a common beggar, whose success depends on the dolefulness of his story." p. 15.

But how would this evil, (if it be a real one), be cured by a different method of management? If the minuteness and the greatness of the responsibility, expose a beneficiary to the evils here mentioned, then, of course, a diminution in both these respects would relieve the evil. But I have always been accustomed to believe, that minuteness of responsibility, and the greatness and certainty of it, is the highest and most effectual of all means to keep men honest and straight in their business. And I appeal to the whole world for a spontaneous decision on this point, without a single argument upon it; for it certainly needs none. If you wish to tempt men to dishonesty and partial statements of their concerns or their management, hold them at loose ends in their accounts; if not, then create a high responsibility. I am utterly unable to see how the temptation is now any greater to give a false account of expenditures, than it would be under a system of inspection less rigid.

And as to "placing the receiver in the attitude of a common beggar, whose success depends on the dolefulness of his story;" how is this *dolefulness* made any greater or less, by the fact that a man is accountable in regard to more or less of his expenditures? If there be any "hitting the point" here, I am not able to perceive it. Nay, if there be any thing in the revolting idea of "common beggary," which is applicable to the subject in question; then let me ask, Who is most like a "*common* beggar?" He who comes with a piteous story of his wants in a lump, without entering, or being able to enter, into any particulars which are in any measure probable, or will bear the least scrutiny; or he who brings along with him *accredited vouchers* for all his wants and woes, and can *definitely* show how they come to exist, and to be urgent? The case is too plain to need comment; and the statement must have escaped from the Reviewer, in a moment when imagination had strong predominance over reflection.

But when the Reviewer proceeds, in connexion with the allegations just examined, to say, that "young men of delicate and ingenuous feelings shrink from this *public* development of private and personal circumstances," p. 15; he shows a want of information in respect to the subject on which he has commented, that might well have led him to hesitate and examine, before he ventured to speak in this way. And what is the "*public* development?" Just this; viz. that the beneficiary goes with his Schedule to one who is or ought to be his most confidential and paternal friend, to the head of the School or College in which he is, and obtains his certificate as to the credibility of the statement; and this certificate comes before the Directors of the A. E. Society, who are also *in loco parentum*, and who vote of course in accordance with it, unless they have some special ground to suspect that there is collusion or fraud. And is this a "*public* development?" I know not indeed that the Reviewer meant to convey so much as his words do convey, I understood by them, an intimation that the Schedules of all the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society are published to the world, i. e. that they are a part of the regular documents of the Society which are to be made public. I may be mistaken in my apprehension, but I predict, that thousands in our country will understand it just as I have done; and if so, may I be pardoned for suggesting, that the Reviewer is accountable for an impression so much *at variance with fact*, and tending to cast odium on the Directors of the A. E. Society, as men wanting in delicacy of feeling, and disposed to be rigid, to an unreasonable degree, in their demands. I trust he will therefore pardon me, and indeed thank me, for making public the correction of such an error. I certainly do not charge him with any intended error; I acquit him altogether of this. But I must still believe, that when such great interests are concerned as are called in question here, men are bound to know that what they state as facts is correct.

I have one more remark to make on this subject. This is, that *facts* contradict the statement which the Reviewer has made, about the reluctance of young men to submit to the accountability in question. More than 900 young men, educated in 77 Academies, 23 Colleges, and 10 Theological Seminaries; during the last 14 years, have submitted to an inspection of this nature, and for half that period the present Schedule has been in actual existence, and yet it is not known, as I have before said, that any complaints have been made. If the Reviewer has found "more than one young man of unquestionable piety," who declined asking aid of the A. E. Society because of the strictness and minuteness of accountability to which he would be subjected; then I can only say, that his experience differs widely from that stated above. I cannot refrain from adding, too, that if *accountability* will deter any young man from asking aid, it is my earnest hope and wish, that the A. E. Society may never have any beneficiaries of this character. They want such, and only such, as are willing to be open to inspection, and shrink not from every responsibility that is requisite to give confidence to the public and to the world.

I come now to the SECOND OBJECTION of the Reviewer against the measures of the A. E. Society. This is, that the principle of "refunding the moneys advanced to young men patronized, is a doubtful, if not a dangerous feature of this Institution," p. 15.

The reasons for this measure he represents as being two, viz: 1. To relieve the beneficiary from the mortification of being considered a charity student. 2. To augment the means and perpetuate the benefits of the Society.

But are these all the reasons? Certainly not. In the eleventh Report of the Society, the Directors say, that "because, after *much experience*, they are convinced that loans will exert a more happy influence upon the *character* of those whom they patronize," they have embarked in this measure. They tell us, that the same experience proves, that more strength of character, more economy, more diligence, more frugality, will be promoted by it. This I do most fully believe. Nay, from long experience and observation, I might say, I do certainly know it. And if this be correct, it is a very important reason for their measures, which the Reviewer has not at all suggested.

He is mistaken, also, when he speaks of the *loan* as designed to be a "shelter for charity students, from the unmerited reproach often attempted to be cast upon them."

The young men in this condition, are now too numerous, and too respectable for worth and for talents, to need any such shelter. The voice of the Church and of the community, is too much in their favour to render it at all necessary. *Disgrace* is out of the question. But *delicacy of feeling* is not out of the question; and to my certain knowledge, many a young man, that would have abandoned his education rather than obtain it by *gratuity*, now has no scruples in receiving a *loan*. And this shows the wisdom of the measure, which the A. E. Society have adopted?*

In regard to the "high ground" which the church should take, in the opinion of the Reviewer, and educate gratuitously all that are needed for the ministry, as our Government educate young men in their naval and military schools; this is desirable then, and only then, when it becomes *necessary*. The question whether it is *necessary*, is the very one in debate. And if such ground should be prejudicial to the character of beneficiaries, (and experience it is believed has established this fact), then is a different ground preferable, unless it can be shown to be the occasion of formidable evils. The money that would be expended on the wholly *gratuitous* education of young men for the ministry, may now be appropriated to missionary objects, to building up our waste places, to helping our feeble Churches, and to providing for their starving pastors.

The Reviewer does not see the propriety of calling the loan made to beneficiaries, *a parental loan*. He wishes to know what is meant by such a loan; and suggests that obligations, like those demanded by the A. E. Society, are not required from children by their parents, p. 16.

Is it then true, in the first place, that the young men of the Church have the same relation to her, as to *support*, which children have to their parents? If so, then why may not the rich as well as the poor, claim support from her? Indeed the case of the Cadets, which the writer presents, who are supported at the expense of the government, would seem designed to justify this principle; for *all* are equally supported in this case, whether they are rich or poor. Would the Reviewer say, that a Church struggling with poverty, and not adequate to maintain its own pastor; or that an individual in circumstances of indigence, who belongs to any Church; should contribute money or labour to help to educate the son of a rich member of the Church? This cannot be done; it ought not to be done. And if it be said, in reply to this, that the rich ought to give the more bountifully in such a case, so as that, in the end, the poor man will be more than compensated for his contribution towards educating the sons of the rich; the answer is, that justice indeed would require this; but how is it to be enforced? Are all professed Christians who are rich, and who may have pious sons, willing voluntarily to contribute in such a way? Facts speak a loud and appalling testimony against such an assumption.

---

* The following extract of a letter from the President of one of our Colleges, affords a striking illustration of the truth of the above remark. It is published in the Quarterly Journal of the Society, Vol. I. p. 32, and relates to the case of a peculiarly needy young man.

"He tells me that he has been repeatedly advised to apply for aid to your Society, but never could so far sacrifice his love of independence as to consent to it. He was, however, from the difficulty of getting along without too much loss of time from his studies, becoming discouraged, and on the point of abandoning the hope of public usefulness. I explained to him the method of *loaning* money now adopted by the Society, as calculated to save the feelings of young men, and advised him to apply. He concludes to do so, and has gone to ———, to procure the required testimonials."

There remains no way then, if the principle of the Reviewer be adopted, but for the Church to *tax* her members, and make out the regular proportion which ought to be paid, and must be paid by them. Any other method than this, can never be just and equitable, provided the *Cadet System*, to which the Reviewer has appealed as affording so noble an example, be adopted by the Church. It is by taxation and by compulsion, that the system is supported. Can the Churches resort to similar measures?

Does not the specious object, then, which seemed to be so attractive while examined at a distance, and in the midst of the shining mist in which it was enveloped, assume a form entirely different, on near approach and after minute inspection?

The proposal of the Reviewer, I must regard as chimerical and impossible, unless we are to have a religious establishment, supported and rendered compulsory by the civil power. The Reviewer would himself be among the last men, who would desire any thing like this, or who would cease to oppose and resist it.

Things must remain then as they are, in regard to charities. Those who give, must do it VOLUNTARILY; not by assessment, or by compulsion. And while this is the case, it is quite certain that the Church will consent to educate only the indigent part of her sons. These she ought not to educate, I trust she will not, without efforts of their own, and without a high responsibility as to the manner in which they dispose of her bounty, and high and sacred obligations to become what she desires them to be.

The Reviewer thinks it strange, that the loan should be called *parental*. He wishes to know, whether parents lend money to their children; and then, whether in case they do, they demand written obligations of repayment? The answer to this might be, that it is no new thing for parents to make *loans* to their children; and to insist on it, that they shall be repaid, in case there is ability to do it. I could appeal, in proof of this, to my own experience. I have sons to educate; but I am unable to complete their education, unless the older ones do themselves contribute to assist the younger. I make this a condition of completing their education; and I have no scruples in doing so, although I would hope and trust that I am not deficient in parental tenderness. I even consider it a serious advantage to my children, to be placed under such a responsibility.

Let it be remembered, however, that the property in the hands of the A. E. Society is not *their own*. They are entrusted with the sacred bounties of the Church. They are under the most solemn obligations to see that nothing is squandered, nothing is left insecure. They must, therefore, on the principle of *loaning*, require a *written* security. If the sum in question, in any case, be lost to the Society for want of due care, they are responsible for it. In these respects, therefore, it is far from being fair, to compare their situation with that of a parent.

If it be still asked, Why then call the loan *parental?* The answer is; Because it is truly so, in some very important respects; i. e. it is an *accommodating* loan; it is afforded from mere motives of KINDNESS; and is very different in regard to the conditions attached to it, from common loans. No interest is required, until a reasonable time after the young man has entered the ministry; the *only* surety is *his own note;* and it is further expressly provided by the Directors, " that in case the future condition of those who are patronised by the Society, in consequence of any calamity, or of the service in the Church to which they may be providentially called, or the peculiar situation in which they may be placed, shall in the judgment of this Board be found to be such, as to render it unsuitable for them to be called upon to pay the debt contracted for their education, it shall be understood to be the right and *duty* of the Board, to cancel such debt in whole or in part, whenever they shall judge proper." Eleventh Report, p. 22.

What more now can reasonably be asked, than is here granted? It will be agreed by all, that such beneficiaries as can repay, ought in justice and in conscience to do it. But how will it be with those, who may be in a state of extreme poverty and dependence? Why the debt will be cancelled. There is ample provision, express *legal* provision, for this purpose. This must be admitted. What then is the hardship in this case? There can surely be none, unless the Directors are so lacking in humanity, as to shut their ears against any complaints of indigence and misfortune which their beneficiaries may make. Has this ever been done? I ask this question fearlessly. I know the Directors too well to have any apprehensions about the answer. Nay, I challenge the whole world to produce an instance, where this imputation justly lies against them.

The oppressive nature of the loan in question, then, is only in *fear*, in *anticipation*, not in *fact*. It is indeed possible, that the Directors may abuse their commission to be compassionate; it is possible for any man or body of men to abuse any trust committed to them; but the *probability* of this, in the case now before us, is certainly one of the remotest that can be imagined. And even supposing it actually to take place, there is an appeal from the Directors to the whole Society, composed of members from at least twenty States in the Union, who can reverse their decisions, and displace them from office.

I have been minute on this part of the subject, because I am aware, that there is an appeal in the representations of the Reviewer, to the *compassion* of the community toward the beneficiaries of the Society. Their case is presented as one, which must bear exceedingly hard upon them, after they are settled in the ministry; and they are made to appeal to our sensibilities, on the score of a family, who are suffering for want of bread, an empty library, an inability to aid the charitable objects of the day, and other things of the like nature. Now all of this has some foundation in reality; but all cases of this nature are actually provided for, as we have seen above, and this, even to the utmost extent which a considerate man can desire. I must believe that the Reviewer had never studied or contemplated the provision so fully made, when he wrote the paragraphs on which I have now been commenting.

I have one more remark to make on this important part of our subject. This is, that *facts* contradict the theory which the Reviewer has here presented. As a specimen of the many *facts* which lie before the Directors of the A. E. Society, I present the following extract of a letter from one of their beneficiaries.

"Enclosed is —— dollars, which, added to what I have given the last year, makes the amount of the benefactions I received from your Society. My donations for several years previous, whether more or less, you may regard in the light of *interest*; and in the same light you may regard all my future donations, which I purpose to continue annually, as long as I have any thing to give. My salary is small; and though my family is also small, we have to consult the principles of economy, and to deny ourselves many things, in order to have an agency in the various great departments of Christian charity. Our rule is, *first*, to economise; *secondly*, to give "bountifully," according to the Scripture maxim, 2 Cor. ix. 6.; and then, *thirdly*, if we have any thing to spare, to lay it up until the Lord shall call for it;—and we find so much enjoyment in this course, that we shall probably continue it." (Quarterly Register and Journal, Vol. I. p. 28—9.)

This is only a specimen of the manner in which, I trust, a great part of the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society feel, and will feel. They would be among the last, I verily believe, to propose the giving up of their *obligations* to the Society. And this applies to those who have gone out from Theological Seminaries, and have settled in parishes, and know by experience all the difficulties with which they must struggle, and to which the Reviewer adverts. Testimony from these is worth more than all the theory in the world. The gentleman, whose testimony is cited above, and who holds a conspicuous place among the labourers in the great Missionary cause, is one who has had some of the difficulties to struggle with. Is such experience, now, to be regarded by the Directors of the A. E. Society? Or are they to shape their measures solely by principles deduced from reasoning *a priori?*

In regard to the allegation of the Reviewer, which stands connected with this part of our subject, viz. that "the *loaning* system will tend to create a calculating, craving disposition," I have already remarked upon the subject above. I can only say again, that the cultivation of economical habits, of frugality, and industry, is one of the last things that can ever make misers and niggards. I must have overwhelming evidence to induce me to believe, that the God of nature has so formed us, that the cultivation of virtues necessarily leads to vices.

As a test of the ability and willingness of the A. E. Society's beneficiaries to repay the loan which they have contracted, I would add, that within little more than *two* years (although the system has as yet begun only partially to operate,) more than Two thousand dollars have been cheerfully repaid into the Treasury. So much for the *practicability* of the measure adopted by the A. E. Society.

The Reviewer has suggested, also, under his second objection, that Colleges and Theological Seminaries must likewise aid young men, who are indigent, in obtaining their education; and that, in case they do this, the young men will be utterly unable to discharge their obligations both to the A. E. Society, and to these Institutions.

Suppose this to be true; then it follows that the A. E. Society must abandon their claim, according to the pledge which they have given to the young men and to the world. The Colleges and Theological Seminaries must do the same in some cases of imperious necessity. But in ordinary cases, a young man of real industry, and good talents, (no others ought to be educated by the funds of the Church), will find ways and means to help himself, so that he need not receive more aid, than it will be safe for him to be obliged to repay. Experience abundantly testifies this. It is well known that some young men, entirely destitute of property, acquire an education without appealing to any society or individual for assistance; and surely it is practicable for young men, situated as are the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society, to do what is required of them.

Besides, means are now used, and the prospect is now opening, for young men to aid themselves by *manual labour;* which is very useful to them both in a physical and intellectual respect. To this source, the Directors of the A. E. Society are anxiously directing young men. Between NINE and TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS have been earned in various ways the past year, by the beneficiaries of the Society. The Reviewer seems to be, and doubtless is, unacquainted with these and the like facts; otherwise he would not reason and assert as he does.

The A. E. Society do not wish to conceal it from the public, that it is a favourite principle with them, to induce so far as in them lies, all their young men to help themselves in every honest and becoming manner, and to the full extent of their ability. The enterprising and intelligent men of our country will certainly justify them in this.

But the Reviewer asks, "What becomes of the moneys when refunded?" He then goes on to aver, that they are all returned to the treasury of the parent Society; and that in consequence of such an arrangement, this Society will finally have an unlimited capital at their exclusive control. Add all the loans returned to the permanent funds, and to the scholarships, and he thinks, in half a century "a height of independence must be attained, sufficient to make even good men's heads turn giddy," p. 19. In particular he suggests, that "if all the Presbyterian churches in the United States were to become auxiliary to the A. E. Society, the moneys refunded by all their beneficiaries, as well as their annual surplus, must go to the parent Board, and *be entirely beyond the reach of the Branches*," p. 19.

I shall not take the liberty to impute any special design to the writer, in this appeal. The correctness of the principles and the assertions, on which it is grounded, are proper subjects of examination.

If there be any one thing, which the Directors of the A. E. Society have particularly aimed to accomplish in all their measures with respect to the Society, it is this, viz: that it should be guarded as effectually as possible against a perversion, or monopoly of the funds. In order to effect this, *the ultimate responsibility in all cases, is vested in the General Society.* To them all questions may be referred; and before them, every alleged grievance or perversion be laid, for their final and irreversible decision.

Who then are the men that constitute the General Society? They consist of evangelical clergymen and laymen, throughout the United States. The whole number of members entitled to vote, is, at present, about Three hundred and fifty. These belong to at least Twenty States of the Union; and one hundred and eleven of them are either clergymen or laymen of the Presbyterian church. This church would have had a much greater proportion still, had the A. E. Society originally set out on the same ground on which it now stands. The Society originated in the heart of N. England. For many years, (down so late as 1826), a certain sum of money, given by way of donation, entitled every one to the privilege of voting. The Society was thus at the mercy of any party, whether evangelical or not, that might choose to create members enough at any time, to come in and take entire possession of all its funds. In 1826, the Constitution was changed, and only members *elected* were in future admitted to the privilege of *voting;* although a donation to a certain extent still constitutes *honorary membership.* None *originally* entitled to vote, were excluded from this privilege by the new arrangement. And as to the future, the *Society,* (not the Directors, as the Reviewer seems to understand it), *elect by ballot,* those who are to be members.

Before 1826, when this important change was made, there had been, as will naturally be supposed, many more donations in N. England, which entitled to membership, than elsewhere. In fact, during the first ten years of the existence of the Society, out of one hundred thousand dollars contributed, seventy thousand dollars were given in Massachusetts. This accounts for it, why the number of members of the Society, belonging to the Congregational church is greater than that of any other denomination. And this is the only reason; for since the change in question, 94 members have been elected; and of these, 74 are out of N. England, and only *two* belong to Massachusetts. *Fifty* of the newly elected members belong to the States of New-York, New-Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Does this look like local partiality? Or is there any party ambition or purposes, discoverable in this?

I repeat it, in order that neither the Reviewer nor his friends may overlook it; *The Directors neither nominate nor choose any of the elected members of the Society.*

From these plain facts it is very obvious, that the time is not far distant, when the Presbyterian church may have, and in all probability will have, a controlling influence in the

A. E. Society. Every act of the Board of Directors is subject to revision, directly or indirectly, by the General Society. Every choice of members and every choice of officers, (who, let it be noted, are elected only for *one year* at a time,) is by the same *Society.* How then can its funds be perverted, or applied to party purposes? Never,—until all branches of the General Society, including evangelical men of at least five denominations, become corrupt throughout. And when such a *universal* corruption takes place, the A. E. Society will at least be as safe as any other Society, whether Presbyterian or not.

Let us now, for a moment, examine in another point of view, the power of the Directors of the Parent Society, which is an object of so much dread. We have seen how entirely their doings are subject to revision by the General Society. Another check is imposed upon them by means of Branch Societies. *All applications for aid* within the limits of Branch Societies, *must first be made to these Branch Societies.* The Directors of these appoint a *majority* of the Examiners of such applicants; on whose certificate depends the success of the application. When a favourable certificate is obtained from these Examiners, it is remitted to the Board of the Branch Society first, who receive or reject the application, and make an appropriation. The application is then forwarded to the Board of the Parent Society, for their concurrence. If they think it their duty to reject the application, they remit the case back to the Branch Society, with their objections. Should a final disagreement take place between the two Boards, the case must come before the General Society at their annual meeting, at which are present members from all parts of the U. States. This has an ultimate jurisdiction over every question of this, or of the like nature.

It is thus, that the two Boards in question serve as a check upon each other; and the General Society has a supervision and ultimate control of the whole. In addition to this, there is an article of the Constitution which expressly provides, that *Presidents of Branch Societies shall be, ex officio, voting members of the General Society, and also honorary members of the Board of Directors*, thereby giving to each Branch Society a perpetual representation of its own selection, in the councils both of the Society and of the Board. Is this aiming at the concentration of power in the hands of the

Directors of the Parent Society? Or does it look like a most guarded distribution of power, and a cautious check upon it, not unlike what the structure of our national government exhibits?

'Are not the Branch Societies, however, dependent on the Parent Society?' They must, of course, conform all their proceedings to its Constitution and fundamental Rules. But they elect their own officers, from the least to the greatest, and as often as they please; they vote their own appropriations, and dispose of their own funds; they recommend and receive their own candidates. The Parent Board has, indeed, the power of nominating a part of the Examining Committees; but it is a *minority* of them; and this right is retained only for security in regard to the Constitution and Rules, which they are bound to see observed. The Parent Society, except in an extreme case which is provided for, cannot take up a single candidate, within the limits of a Branch Society, without its consent and approbation; while, on the other hand, the concurrence of the Parent Society is necessary, in order that the appropriation may be actually made; unless, indeed, in a case of appeal, the General Society revoke their decision where they may have refused aid.

'But what control have the Branch Societies over the moneys given?' I answer, that all moneys raised within the limits of a Branch Society are paid into its own treasury. If *permanent* Scholarships are endowed, the property vests in the Parent Society, because it is an *incorporated* body; but *the income of the said Scholarships stands pledged to the Branch Societies, within whose limits they have been raised*, and is subject to their disposal as stated above. Can the Parent Society adopt a more impartial method of proceeding than this?

Look, moreover, at the operation of this principle. When a Branch Society has more moneys in its treasury, than is needed for beneficiaries within its own limits, it remits the overplus to the Treasury of the Parent Society. But on the other hand, if it have less in its Treasury than is needed, (an occurrence that frequently happens,) then it is entitled to draw out of the treasury of the Parent Society, just as though the money were in its own. If this be not generous impartiality, it would be difficult to say what is so, in the management of such matters.

In regard to the Examining Committees whose peculiar province it is to recommend beneficiaries to the A. E. Society, I would state, that at present there are 41 of them in the U. States; of these, 14 only are in N. England, and 27 out of it. And when we call to mind, that a majority of each of these Committees, on whom the appropriation of all moneys to beneficiaries depends, are appointed by the respective Branch Societies, in all cases where such Societies exist, this must be proof satisfactory enough to every candid mind, that the Parent Society is not aiming at power and control.

While I am on the subject of the organization and powers of the A. E. Society, and its respective branches, I would state, that the General Society, constituted as above, has recently held its annual meetings, alternately in Boston and New York, during the week of their respective anniversaries. This arrangement will probably continue, and by means of it, the Society will be brought into the vicinity of a very large part of all the voting members. Should the next meeting be held in the city of New York, more members will probably be in the city, having a right to vote in the meeting of the A. E. Society, than will compose the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. The meeting for the choice of officers, and for the transaction of special business, is distinct from, and antecedent to, the general meeting when addresses, etc. are made, as is customary in other Societies. At this *previous* meeting, any business whatever may be taken up; all proceedings of the Directors may be examined and canvassed; and objections can be raised, which any member of the Society chooses to raise, either against any part of its proceedings, or of its principles. *No officer whatever is chosen for a longer period than one year at a time;* and if the Society see fit, every Director, Secretary, Treasurer, or other officer previously appointed, may be displaced, and others substituted in their room. If there be any aim in all this at dictatorship, it is not, at least, to be *perpetual* dictators.

From a review of the Constitution and principles of the Parent and Branch Societies, it seems to me quite impossible, that any partial or party appropriations of moneys should be made by the Directors of the Parent Society, without a speedy and adequate accountableness and punishment for so doing. The General Society at its annual meeting, coming from all parts of the U. States, must be an *impartial* body; and in their hands are Directors, Secretaries, Treasurers, Examiners, funds, and every thing else. Can an imagination which is not heated, see any phantoms of a frightful aspect rising up out of such ground as this?

To the important question, "What becomes of the moneys refunded?" We may answer, then, that they go into the treasury of the Parent Society, for the present, and are paid out from this to all the Branch Societies in the U. States, according to their respective wants. They must ever continue to be so appropriated, until the General Society cease to do their duty at their annual meeting; and until all parts of our country become heretical and corrupt.

If, for the sake of convenience, however, the General Society should adopt a plan, which would allow the moneys *returned* within the limits of each Branch Society, to be paid into the treasury of such Society, this measure would remove even the semblance of the difficulty which the Reviewer suggests. The Directors, I have no doubt, will be disposed to adopt this, or any other arrangement which may promote the interests of the Society.

In thus detailing the Constitution and principles of the A. E. Society, I trust that I have obviated most of the difficulties which the Reviewer suggests under his,

THIRD HEAD OF OBJECTIONS. The substance of this head is, that the *voting* members of this Society are *eligible* to office; and that their election must depend on the Directors of the Parent Society; that such an arrangement is giving them a power to perpetuate their own office, and their own control over an immense sum of money, which may be appropriated to purposes destructive to the welfare of the church. And this organization is represented to be such, that "the hand of an infant in Boston can control and manage and direct the whole Christian community, South and West of the Connecticut, interested in this concern," p. 21.

The answer to all this is found in the preceding statement. It is built on misapprehension of the Constitution and Rules of the A. E. Society. The Directors as such, have no control at all over the election of any new members of the Society, nor over the number who shall be chosen. They have not even a nomination of such members confided to them; and should they undertake to make one, any other member of the Society has an equal right, and I may add, an equal chance of success. After such a view as has been given above, of the manner in which *membership* and the *right of voting* in the Society, are now constituted, and of the number of members, their partition among different denominations of Christians, and their diffusion among 20 States of the Union; can it well be supposed, that any man of candour will say, that the fears of the Reviewer are well grounded? Is there no check here? Are there no honest men, among all these members of the A. E. Society, chosen from leading men in Church and State in our country; no independent men there, who cannot be flattered or misled by any electioneering of the Directors? And are there not men enough among the present members of the Society, of sufficient prudence, and integrity, to secure the interests of the Society in future, by the choice of members like themselves? To deny either of these, would be one of the last things which I would venture to do.

On serious revision of what the Reviewer has intimated, with respect to this subject, I do hope and believe, that he will withdraw even an implied insinuation of such a nature. Representations of this kind may, indeed, be a forcible appeal to the jealousies of men, and of parties; but they must be distressing to those who look seriously at the tendency of them to shake the confidence of the Christian community, and to fill them with groundless alarm; and of course, to quench their zeal in behalf of the A. E. Society.

I have thus examined the *facts* alleged by the Reviewer, as grounds of distrust and fear, in regard to the A. E. Society. I know I am in danger of protracting the subject too much; but the importance of the discussion induces me to cast myself on the patience of the public, until I make a still further development of the proceedings of this Society, in regard to *loans* and *permanent funds*, which may serve to vindicate them in the view of the world.

Originally, the A. E. Society appropiated their moneys in the method advocated by the Reviewer. They made the whole a pure gratuity. They even adopted the principle of paying the *bills* of their beneficiaries. Soon, however, experience showed the improvidence of this measure. They then adopted the method of requiring a note from the beneficiary, to repay *one half*. This took place in 1820, and was continued until 1826.

Before this principle was adopted, in 1826, of *loaning* wholly, the A. E. Society, by their Secretary and Directors, held an extensive correspondence with the heads of Colleges and Seminaries in different parts of the U. States, and with distinguished clergymen and laymen of several States, in regard to this and other subjects. In this manner they laboured faithfully to ascertain the sentiments and feelings of the community; and especially of those who had superintended the education of beneficiaries of the A. E. Society. As a specimen of the communications which they received in answer to their applications, I would subjoin the following extract of a letter, addressed to the Directors of the Society, by the intelligent, judicious, and excellent President of Union College at Schenectady. It is dated Nov. 1825.

"In general, I am very favourably impressed with respect to the wisdom of the plans of the Board, and the prudence and the energy with which those plans are executed; and in conclusion, I have therefore only to add, that from all that I have seen of the effect of public charity, on the physical, moral, and religious character of young men, I am of opinion that appropriations from such charity should be sparingly made. A greater number can then be assisted; and the motive to personal exertion, will not be entirely removed from any. In the free and long continued distribution of a public charity, there is danger that an opinion will be insensibly induced, that the amount distributed is the payment of a debt due, requiring no special gratitude in the receipt, or economy in the application—and there is also danger lest those accustomed to be taken care of by others, should insensibly cease to care for—and lose the habit of taking care of themselves. In a country like ours, where the support of the ministry must be voluntary, and where the people, if supplied at all, must be generally supplied by ministers who can live on small salaries, it is wise as far as practicable, to raise up men who can *so* live. And if the ground already gone over, were to be again gone over, it might be a question whether a system of loans, *in toto*, on a low interest, would not on the whole be wiser than a system of donations. Perhaps more would not *thus* be refunded, than will now be; assistance however would be equally within the reach of the persons who needed it; self-interest would operate more strongly to narrow their expenditures; and an increased stimulus to personal exertion, would be applied during the whole preparatory state. The incumbents on the fund would be known, not as paupers living on charity, bnt as indigent young men struggling with poverty, and calculating to repay the favours done them, out of the fruits of their future earnings."

Many important testimonies of the like nature were received, also, soon after the measure in question was adopted; as may be seen by referring to the Appendix in the Eleventh Report of the Society, where will be found the testimonies of no less than nine Presidents of Colleges, of several Professors, and of many other Gentlemen of high reputation, besides communications expressing the views of about 70 beneficiaries belonging to four Colleges, and highly approving the measure in question.* Several other Societies had also adopted similar principles, or have adopted them since. The business-men of the community called aloud for such an arrangement. Before it was adopted, the treasury of the Society began to languish. Since its adoption, the receipts have been greatly augmented. Some who doubted about the principle, at the outset, have come fully into the approbation of it, since it has been put to the test of experience.

Such were the efforts of the Directors of the A. E. Society to learn their duty, and such the results of these efforts. Will any one say, in view of these facts, that they ought to have hesitated about acting as they have done?

Nay, I make the appeal nearer home to the Reviewer; I may refer him to the General Assembly. In their minutes of this very year; their Board of Education say, "We desire every beneficiary to remember, that his duty to the church, to his younger brethren who seek the same holy office, and to his Saviour, requires that so soon as he is able, he should refund the benefaction conferred on him with interest. Every beneficiary shall be furnished with an attested copy of this resolution." p. 426.

---

* These testimonials are signed by Presidents Day—Nott—Davis—Griffin—Humphrey—Bates—Tylor—Wayland, and Allen—by Professor Rice of Virginia, Rev. Dr Spring of N. York—the late Rev. Dr Chester of Albany, whose opinion, the result of his own observation and experience, as he assured the Secretary of the Society, is given in decided terms in favour of the system of "parental loan"—the Rev. Dr Church of New Hampshire—Jeremiah Evarts, Esq.—Professor, now President Woods, of Lexington, Kentucky;—Rev. Justin Edwards—the late Rev. Dr Payson, of Maine;—Professor Dewy; Rev. Messrs Cox and Patton, of New York; Rev. Mr. Nettleton, and a number of other clergymen of known character and respectability.

See also the 11 Rep. Prot. Epis. Ed. Soc. presented Oct. 1828. The Presbytery of Albany, and the late young men's Education So. N. Y. adopted the system of loaning before the A. E. Society.

The Reviewer will perceive, that the General Assembly's Board of Education have here recognized, in the most distinct manner, the *duty* of its beneficiaries towards "the church, their younger brethren, and the Saviour" himself, to refund not only the sums of money furnished them by the Board, but to return the same "with interest," in all cases where they are able. How does this differ at all from "the *principle* of refunding" adopted by the A. E. Society? They cancel the debt, *in case of inability to pay it;* the Assembly's Board do not think that more than this *ought* to be done. And although they do not require a *written* obligation, they require that every Student should be furnished with a copy of their resolution, which certainly amounts to a *printed* obligation. If there be any advantage in this latter measure over the former, I confess myself unable to perceive what it is. Indeed I have difficulties, of serious import in my own view, in respect to this measure of the Assembly's Board. The young men who, on the score of *duty*, thus become their debtors, are left in a state in which their generosity and their honour, merely, are appealed to; and in case they decline making repayment, they are liable to be filled with apprehension that their motives may be misconstrued. But in case they are expressly liberated from their obligations by those to whom they are due, no such apprehensions will exist. In which of these predicaments would any young man of generous feelings prefer to be? And suppose cases to occur, (and such do occur), in which a young man abandons the object for which he was patronized, or becomes an apostate and disgraces the ministry; then how are the General Assembly's Board to obtain the repayment of the moneys expended? In this case, the A. E. Society have a security that such moneys shall not be lost to the treasury of the church.

But lest I should be tedious, I will cut short the further consideration of *facts* alleged by the Reviewer, and come to the consideration,

II. Of Fears.

The Reviewer is afraid of the immense power, which he thinks the Parent Society will ultimately attain. These fears he has unequivocally expressed in the following language. Speaking of the *election of members by ballot*, he says, "Whatever may be the effect of this arrangement in preventing or retarding the perversion of the funds from the original purpose, it certainly increases the power of the officers and Directors to an almost unlimited extent. It enables them, if so disposed, to select the persons who are to vote in choosing Officers and Directors; so that in fact they might as well be elected for life, with the power of nominating their own successors. Suppose that at any time a majority of acting members of the Society are in favour of the measures adopted by the Directors, the Directors can, through their friends, have new voting members chosen, favourable to the same course; so that it will in the end amount to the same thing, as to give the Directors the power of appointing their successors. The distant members, who have a right to vote, can seldom attend the anniversaries; so that from the nature of the case, the election of officers and new members, can always be under the control of those residing near the place of holding the annual meetings. If at any time, the concerns of the Society should be mismanaged, it is evident from the very terms of the compact, that the branches and distant contributors, have no means of effecting a reformation; because they have voluntarily surrendered their rights into the hands of a body politic in the State of Massachusetts. And as this corporation can hold real estate, whose annual income shall equal ten thousand dollars; can increase permanent funds, and scholarships, to any extent; can dispose at pleasure of the annual surplus of the auxiliaries, and the moneys returned by beneficiaries, and has also a *veto* on the appropriations of the branches; its power must become immense.* And the organization is so adjusted, the machinery is so admirably arranged as to concentrate the whole power in a single point; so that the hand of an infant, touching a lever in Boston, can control, and manage, and direct the whole Christian community, South and West of the Connecticut, interested in this concern," p. 20—21.

As to the *facts* here alleged, they have already been examined. The amount of the *fears* is, that there may be, or will be, perversion of power and funds.

Again, in canvassing the subject of moneys loaned being returned to the general treasury, he says;

"Add these moneys refunded to the permanent funds and scholarships entrusted to the immediate care of the Parent Society, and it seems to us, that if this process were to go on for half a century, a height of independence must be attained, sufficient to make even good men's heads turn giddy. From the very constitution of the society, whose claims to universal patronage we have presumed to examine, it must every year be growing more and more independent, not only of the original contributors, but also of the auxiliaries; and it must also be acquiring a more extensive influence over the ministers of the gospel in the United States. Let us suppose that some twenty or thirty years hence, one half of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church shall have been educated under this system, and that the bonds of many of them remain unpaid in the hands of the Directors, in the vicinity of Boston, and that in these circumstances a proposition was made in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, to change some important feature in her discipline or doctrines, and that the Directors of the A. E. Society were known to think favourably of these changes—what would be the consequence? We all know how wonderfully interest influences the opinions even of good men, and how prone they are to coincide in sentiment with those on whom they are dependent," p. 19.

---

* See Rules, Chapter vi. 9.

Here then are two distinct fears; the one, that the power and funds of the Society may be perverted to some sinister purpose, without any adequate control; the other, that the Directors in the vicinity of Boston may, some 20 or 30 years hence, undertake, through the medium of their beneficiaries, "to change some important feature in the doctrines or discipline" of the Presbyterian church.

I am glad the writer has been ingenuous enough to speak out thus plainly the difficulties which he feels on this subject. On *facts*, his difficulties, as it seems to me, cannot rest, when he comes to review them. If so, then they must have their basis in *fears*.

I do him honour, that, while cherishing such fears, he has added a testimony so frank and noble in regard to the present Directors and management of the A. E. Society, as is the following: "We are far from intimating that any such influence is now intended to be attained, and if it were attained, that it would be improperly used. We have the happiness to be personally acquainted with some of the Directors of this great concern, and we know the reputation of all; and we believe them to be as pure in their intentions, as single in their purpose, and as devoted in the cause of evangelical piety, as any men on earth; and we disclaim any knowledge of a single act in their management of this great charity, which has the most remote sectarian bearing," p. 19. And again; "As long as the Directors remain such as we believe they now are, intelligent, active, and devoted to the cause of evangelical doctrine and vital piety, every thing, which the interests of the church and of the world demand, will be done," p. 21.

With these testimonies I do most heartily agree; and I sincerely thank the Reviewer for having given them to the public. It would seem, now, that in his own view, with all his caution and apprehensions, there is, at least, no *present* danger. But then, who can certainly secure us for the future?

None, I answer unhesitatingly, but the great Head of the Church; none but God. And in this respect the A. E. Society does not stand alone. Every College, Theological Seminary, and Academy, in this country, stands on the same footing as to the *future*. Who knows whether the distinguished College and Theological Seminary at Princeton will not, before the next generation passes wholly away, go into the hands of Arminians or Unitarians? None but God, I answer boldly. Experience in other States and countries will support this answer.

The Reviewer has referred to the University at Cambridge, as an example and a proof that funds may be perverted, and that Societies who manage them may become faithless. I acknowledge this, with a feeling of deep distress. But what is the remedy? As a member of the Presbyterian Church, he may answer, "The remedy is in our Creed, and in our Formulas of discipline and doctrine." But has not the Church in Scotland been in possession of these, for almost two centuries? And is the Reviewer ignorant of the fact, that the Moderates, i. e. the Arminians, and Arian-*ish* party, had the predominance in the Church, and swayed all its General Judicatories, for many years, if they do not at the present period? He is surely not ignorant, that there is a large number of Scotch Churches, which are Seceders from the General Assembly of their church, on the ground that the majority had become corrupt.

Or, if he pleases to refer the public attention to the *establishment* in England, and the thirty-nine Articles of the Episcopal Church, will this in any measure, help the cause? Who that knows any thing, does not know that the Church of England, in respect to far the greater majority of its leading members, has been Arminian, I had almost said, for ages; and that for no small period of time, not a few, (and if we may credit the statement of some of its ministers,) a decided majority, were Arian? And if one goes to the Creeds and Confessions of the Dutch and the German Churches, on the Continent of Europe, is the argument helped at all? One glance at the *Neology* of the continent, will answer this question.

I am, indeed, not one of those who have any prejudices whatever against Creeds and Confessions, when used within their proper limits, and assigned to their appropriate places. In fact, whenever I hear a man declaiming against them, in a loose and general manner, I always take it for granted, that it is because he wishes to have the liberty, in some way or other, of inculcating what is opposed to them. But on the other hand, I have no apprehension that we can put them into the same scale with the Bible, in regard to their influence in preserving the unity and purity of the Churches with respect to doctrine and practice. When all is done and said, they are only paper ramparts about the citadel of God; and men will batter them down, whenever their passions or their prejudices are armed against them.

What then is to keep the Theological Seminary at Princeton, from ultimately turning apostate? Is it the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church? How can we any more put our trust in this, than the good people of Scotland could in theirs? Once, men of God filled nearly all the pulpits in their land; but what has been the fact for a century past? Now, most of the members of the Presbyterian General Assembly, I hope and verily believe, are men of God, and devoted to the interests of truth; but how can this prove that it will always be so? And if the General Assembly in the U. States, should take the course of the established Churches in Scotland and in England, then what is to become of the Seminary at Princeton, with all its funds and all its Scholarships, which already amount to more than one half of the permanent funds of the A. E. Society?

What a tremendous engine will it be, to prostrate in the dust every advocate of the truths which it now defends?

And does not the very same argument, (if it be any argument at all), apply to every College, Theological Seminary, Academy, and benevolent Society with funds, in the whole country? Most certainly it does. The next generation—who can tell what they are to be? God only knows. What is the result then? Why, if we are to reason as the Reviewer does, the result is, that we must have no Colleges endowed; no Theological Seminaries of this character; no Academies; no Scholarships; no benevolent Institutions; for even such as are without permanent funds, may be perverted. Nay, the very structure of our government should be altered; for the powers now committed to our legislators and judges, are liable to abuse by bad men, and therefore adapted to become the causes of immense and incalculable injury to the community.

Can any man, now, on sober consideration, adopt or give assent to an argument or a principle, which is connected with such tremendous consequences as those to which the argument of the Reviewer does most plainly and certainly lead? "What proves too much, proves nothing," says the old proverb of the logicians; and it says this very truly.*

---

* An opinion has sometimes been expressed, (and it will be well if the remarks of the Reviewer do not strengthen the belief), that Institutions ought not to have *permanent funds.* In regard to some Institutions for promoting religion and benevolence, this is doubtless true. But is there no danger of inflicting a deep and palpable injury upon the Church, by an indiscriminate condemnation of these important aids in building up the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ in the world? The experience of the best men in all ages, has shown that such funds are exceedingly necessary and useful in promoting some objects of great and permanent interest. As an example, may be mentioned, the work of *education* in nearly all its branches. The A. E. Society, it is believed by very many, comes, to some extent at least, within this class of Institutions. It is not formed for *temporary* purposes. Should the Millennium commence the next year, the object it has in view would be increased, not diminished in importance. "For the poor ye have *always* with you." The means of educating them will always be needed. The responsible duty of supervision, the neglect of which will more than any thing else lead to a perversion of the funds, can never be thoroughly discharged by the officers and agents of Education Societies, unless they are in a good degree relieved from embarrassment, and constant apprehensions as to the *means* of carrying forward the youth under their patronage. The A. E. Society has adopted no new principle on this subject. The plan of establishing Scholarships is of long standing. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian

The reasoning of the Reviewer on page 24, in order to remove suspicion that the General Assembly, as well as the A. E. Society, might possibly betray their trusts, in process of future time, furnishes no answer to the above suggestions; nor is it grounded on any appeal to the history of the General Assembly in past ages, and in other countries. How can all this history be overlooked by intelligent and candid men? The grand remedy proposed by the Reviewer, for all the evils that may occur in the General Assembly's Board of Education, is, that they do not perpetuate their own body; and that the General Assembly, on whom they are dependent, is *annually* elected. But is not this precisely the case with the Directors of the A. E. Society? And after all, who can in either case, give assurance that *those who elect annually*, will not, in process of time, become corrupt? Was not this the case in Scotland? And have we any better security in this country? None, I answer; none that can be any better, so far as merely human arrangements are concerned.

What then is the antidote for our *fears* as to the *future*? Not the General Assembly; nor any other Assembly, or Society, or body of men, or Statutes, or Creeds, or Constitutions. *To trust in God*, and *to do our duty*, is the only ground of hope, that we have or can have, or that we need, in regard to time future. Had Christians more *faith* and less *fear*, the world would be revolutionized in a short time, The treasuries of God would be full to overflowing, and all hands would be set to work, and all hearts engaged, in the glorious enterprise of spreading abroad the knowledge of salvation.

Church have warmly approved it; and the Trustees of that Judicatory already hold sixteen such foundations for the use of the Seminary at Princeton; amounting to a permanent fund of $40,000—which is more than half of all the money vested by the A. E. Society and its Branches, in this manner—and within ten thousand dollars of as much as has yet been actually paid into the treasury of the Society. *Four fifths of all the Scholarships belonging to the A. E. Society, and to its Branches, are merely* TEMPORARY; they are *annual* subscriptions, binding only during the pleasure of the donors. Only *three* permanent Scholarships have been given out of New England; and one of these was by a benevolent lady in Great Britain. In this respect, therefore, those who have jealousies about permanent funds, may find many other Institutions and Societies in our country, which afford, as to the point in question, more ground of jealousy than than the A. E. Society.

In view of all this, I am constrained to wonder that such an objection to the A. E. Society should be brought forward. The argument is simply this; 'Take care how you build up this Society, for should it once become corrupt, it will be a tremendous engine in doing evil.' What! And cannot this be said of every good institution which adorns Society, or blesses mankind? Nay, cannot Christianity itself be abused, and has it not been, to the destruction for time and eternity of millions and millions? But shall there be no Christianity, because it may be abused? Shall there be no endowed Academies, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries, because they may be abused? If so, then let the Reviewer use his eloquence and his influence with the next General Assembly, to take away all the funds from the Princeton Seminary, and to return its Scholarships to the owners. It is in vain for him to say, that there is, or can be, any other security that they will not be perverted, than that which the A. E. Society have, that theirs will not be.

I have a word to say on the fears which he expresses, that, at some future period, the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society, who settle in the South and West, and who are indebted to that Society, may come forward, and out of complaisance to the Directors who live in and near Boston, may vote in such a way as will change the doctrines or the discipline of the Presbyterian Churches.

In the first place, who are to license and settle their young men in the Presbyterian connexion? Of course the several Presbyteries belonging to the General Assembly. Will these Presbyteries, then, ordain young men, most of whom will be educated in Presbyterian Seminaries of learning, who will sell their consciences and their integrity, and break their solemn vows, in order to please the Directors of the Parent Society in and around Boston; and all this, because they owe them a small sum of money? The fact that the Society has no Institutions of its own, but educates young men wherever they pursue a regular course of study, is sufficient proof, that the direct influence which they may have over young men, will ever be secondary. The Society has assisted 40 young men the present year, in four Theological Seminaries belonging to the Presbyterian church; but who will imagine that the influence which the Society holds over these young men, is equal to that of their instructors, or of the Presbyteries to which they stand related? No one, who considers in what manner the Society is constituted, and how entirely the Directors are dependent upon it, can seriously apprehend any evil from this source.

But I have other questions to ask. Whence comes the suspicion, that the Directors in and about Boston, may wish to intermeddle with the doctrines or the discipline of the Presbyterian church? To my certain knowledge, it is habitual with those who now hold that office to recommend to all the young men, who go from N. England into the boundaries of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, to unite with the Presbyteries, and not to hold on upon Congregationalism. A greater mistake cannot be made, than to suppose that they have any zeal on this subject. And should the A. E. Society elect others like them, (which they certainly may do, when they leave the stage, or resign, or whenever the Society chooses to supersede them,) then these same views will be still cherished. Nearly one half of the young men who have gone from the Andover Theological Seminary, have become Presbyterians; and that Seminary allows of Presbyterian Professors, and never has uttered, and I trust will not utter, one word against Presbyterianism.

Let us now turn the tables. The Reviewer calls on the General Assembly to educate their own young men, and not to leave them to others. In this he is in the right. And it is exceedingly cheering, that very many individuals and churches belonging to the connexion of the General Assembly, have long ago embarked in the blessed work which the Reviewer recommends, and now assist in bringing forward at least *two hundred* young men for the ministry, in harmonious connexion with the A. E. Society. The Reviewer has said, that nothing, or nothing to the purpose, has yet been done by the Assembly's Board. But while our Western country is starving for the bread of life, and the world is perishing in wickedness, the A. E. Society have believed that something is to be *done*, and have tried to do it.

Have they ever decried the exertions of other benevolent Societies? Have they ever suggested one syllable, which could raise a suspicion about the motives, or alarm the public about the danger of such Associations? Let it be produced; and for one, I will give them my full share of disapprobation.

On the contrary, they will lift up their hands and hearts to God, with devout thankfulness, when the exhortation of the Reviewer shall be fully heeded by Presbyterian churches, and they will come forward, and take charge of a great host of labourers for the vineyard of the Lord.

But suppose now, when they do this, the Congregationalists should say; 'See, the Presbyterians are filling our country with their pupils and friends. They have a great Society, great Seminaries, many Scholarships, and great zeal for Presbyterianism; and if we wait much longer, they will be too strong for us, and Congregationalism will be driven from the land. What is to be done? Why, this we can do. We can call aloud on the public, and rouse them up to an apprehension of future danger to their religious freedom, and their welfare. We can easily excite the jealousies of the West on this subject, who are already filled with apprehension. We can thus make the candidates of the Presbyterian ministry objects of suspicion, and cause the public zeal in favour of raising them up greatly to abate. And thus Congregationalism may still be safe.'

What could the Reviewer object to this? It is difficult for me to see; for has he not by implication done the same thing? The rectitude of his intention I do not mean to call in question. The correctness of the principle on which his popular appeal to suspicion and party feeling is evidently grounded, (although he may not be conscious of it), is what can never for a moment be defended, until it is decided, that Congregationalists are heretics, and that they have a design to destroy the Presbyterian churches.

In a day like this, when every opposer of vital piety in our land is making an effort to raise a hue and cry about "religious combinations," and "religious establishments," is it prudent, is it wise, is it becoming, is it brotherly, to make such objections as these?

But I must come to a close. And this I shall do by a few words on the last topic proposed for consideration; viz.

III. The method which the Reviewer has chosen, in order to accomplish his object.

I frankly confess that I have a deep feeling on this subject. The obligation to communicate serious doubts and fears about the tendency of any measures so important as those of the A. E. Society, I do fully recognize. The privilege of doing it is an undoubted one. But *how* shall this be done? Shall the tocsin of alarm be sounded through the United States, and all the enemies of religion be set in motion, and have their mouths filled with matter of accusation against the A. E. Society? Thousands will read or hear these accusations or objections, who never listen to the present or to any answer whatever. Is it best to afford matter of clamour to such men? If the Reviewer had serious objections, why not make them directly to the A. E. Society, or to its Directors, and have them canvassed in the meeting of the Society or of the Board? Is there any ground to suppose, that they would not have received an earnest and respectful attention? None. Why then should the public mind be awakened to suspicion, or be agitated about this matter, before it had been canvassed by the Society? If it be proper to accomplish objects of this nature in such a way, then may such members of the Presbyterian church as approve of the writer's views, find hereafter deep reason to regret, that they have sanctioned a principle which allows all their efforts to endow Seminaries of learning, classic or sacred, to be held up as objects of suspicion and of danger.

But I do believe, I may say that I know, that many, very many members of the Presbyterian church never will, and never can, approve either the reasoning and arguments of the Reviewer, or the method which he has chosen in order that they should be felt by the public. *Est modus in rebus.* A great concern like this should not be transacted by an appeal to popular feeling; above all, by an appeal which has its basis in a view of facts altogether imperfect, and in many respects entirely erroneous. As a friend of the A. E. Society, as a disinterested friend, I feel that this Society has reason to complain of such a proceeding; and, if I may judge of the sympathies of others who have read the Reviewer's remarks, I believe its friends will complain aloud, and far and wide too, that justice has not been done to the Society, and that it is not guilty of the mistakes laid to its charge, nor any more exposed to future dangers, than every Society and Seminary in the country, and throughout the world.

The Reviewer will, I trust, forgive the plainness of these remarks, after the plainness with which he has expressed his own views. That they are published to the world is the necessary result of his own Strictures having been published.

Whoever he may be, I honour his talents, and the warmth of his heart in the great and good cause; although I differ widely from him as to some facts, and some principles of reasoning. If any thing which I have said, bears hardly upon him, it results from necessity, not from choice. I could not help endeavouring to show the true results and bearing of his allegations and his reasonings; and if in doing this, there may now and then be something which presses hard, it is not because I wish it, but because the nature of the case demands it.

After all, the A. E. Society fear no canvassing either in public or in private. They exclaim, with one voice, 'If our cause cannot be sustained by an appeal to reason, and argument, and Christian principle, then let it go down!' That it can be sustained, I must fully believe; and I have here proffered my feeble aid, to assist in this great object. But I am most fully aware, that neither my aid, nor that of its present friends, will be adequate to accomplish and to secure all the important objects which it has in view. To God the Saviour, I would most sincerely, most devoutly commend it; and it is my earnest supplication, that the smiles of heaven may be continually afforded it; that all its benevolent measures may be blest; that its friends, and its opposers (if it should have any), may yet be united in rejoicing over it, as the happy instrument of turning many to righteousness; and that future generations may rise up, and call it blessed.

M. Stuart.

REMARKS OF THE EDITORS

ON THE

FOREGOING STRICTURES.

We insert the preceding Strictures, notwithstanding their length and severity, with the utmost readiness. Our object was to bring a subject, which we deem of vital importance, before the churches, with the desire, that it might be candidly and conscientiously considered. As we have no party nor sectarian objects to promote, we are desirous that every thing that can be said in behalf of the A. E. Society, may be fairly and fully presented. We have read these Strictures with the attention due to the subject, and to the source whence they come. We cannot consent, however, to allow them to come before our readers without making such remarks, as we deem necessary for our own justification, and for presenting the subject in its proper light.

The first point, to which we would call the attention of our readers, is the propriety of bringing this subject before the public. Our reasons for taking this course may be very briefly stated. We hold it to be an incontrovertible principle, that public discussion of public measures is essential to the well-being of any community, civil or religious. As this will not be doubted, we shall not argue the point, but simply show, that the course which we saw fit to pursue, is justifiable on this ground; and that, if the friends of the A. E. Society do not mean to put down all discussion, and all examination into its principles and measures, they have no just cause of complaint. What then is the state of the case? Here is a Society proposing for its object the responsible work of preparing young men for the ministry. In the prosecution of this object, it addresses itself to the Christian public for support; it urges its claims with zeal and constancy in every part of the country, not merely in the section where it originated and where it is located, but within the bounds of the Presbyterian church, organizes societies in a large portion of our congregations, and bids fair, in a short time, to get the whole of this important business under its sole direction. Now, supposing that there are a number of men, or *any one man*, who conscientiously believes, that the plan of this society is injudicious, that its principles are of evil tendency, that its organization is peculiarly dangerous, is he to be debarred the privilege of saying so? Is the mere fact that others think differently, to prevent him from presenting in a fair and Christian manner, his difficulties for the consideration of his fellow Christians? We trust not. We trust that the time is far distant, when any society will either wish, or be able, to prevent public discussion or public scrutiny. But it seems, that in this instance, it is regarded as matter of just complaint: not because the Society or its friends are afraid of public discussion, but because they consider, that the proper course for any such individual to pursue, would be to present his objections to the Society itself or its Board of Directors. We thought differently, and think so still, for the following reasons: 1. The appeal of the Society is to the Christian public; to the Christian public therefore belongs the right of judging of its merits; and to the Christian public should be addressed, in our judgment, all the arguments for or against it. 2. We had good reasons for believing, that our objections would produce no effect upon the minds of the Directors. We knew that they had often considered the subject, and had frequently expressed their confidence in the wisdom and excellence of their plans. Where then could be the use of presenting our objections to them? What good could reasonably have been anticipated from such a course? None at all, as the result has proved. The author of these Strictures, who, it may be presumed, speaks the feelings and views of the Board, differs from us entirely in opinion, pronounces our objections of no weight, and is far from supposing that the whole system of the Society should be revolutionized, in order to render it worthy of public confidence. We might, therefore, as well have placed our objections in the fire, as presented them to this Board. The same reasons, with nearly equal force, apply to the idea of bringing them before the Society itself. Its annual meetings, even those for business, are not suitable seasons for the discussion of questions, which involve so many principles and have so many important bearings, immediate and remote. Besides, the only probable method of operating effectually on the minds either of the Board or of the Society, was to bring the matter before the public; to have the reasons for and against, fairly presented; and time given for mature deliberation. The Society could not change its plans, after all that it has said and done, unless a change had previously been wrought in public sentiment on the subject. Now supposing, with such prospects, in case of an appeal to the Society or its Directors, we conscientiously believe (which is in fact the case), that our objections are of deep and solemn weight; that they call for the serious attention of the churches, are we to be denied the privilege of speaking out? Never.

Besides, we knew that these objections, or the most important of them, had been presented again and again to some of the leading members of the Society without effect. It matters not whether the representations were made orally or in writing; the subject was thus brought up, and that too, not merely by those who stood aloof from the Society, but by its own members and friends, some objecting to one feature and some to another. The matter of permanent funds has been more than once strenuously urged on the attention of the excellent Secretary of the Society, without producing any alteration in his views. The whole plan of the loaning system has been objected to, and argued against formally without effect. Now we ask, under these circumstances what good could have been expected from doing what had virtually been done so often, and by so many individuals, before? We think none.

But finally, our object demanded that this appeal should be made to the Christian public. This object was to prevent those of our fellow Christians, who should think with us, when this subject was once fairly presented to their minds, from committing themselves in this business; and to effect if possible through public sentiment, (the only way in which it could be expected), a change in what we honestly consider the objectionable features in the Society. This is an object, which we are neither afraid, nor ashamed to avow, and which, thinking and feeling as we do, it was not only proper but our bounden duty to pursue. We object to this Society, that its system tends to degrade the character of its beneficiaries; that it is inconsistent with the liberty of ministers of the Gospel; and that it gives the Society a power over the destinies of the church, which no set of men on earth ought to possess, and which we are utterly unwilling to submit to. We should object as strenuously to this system, were it pursued by the General Assembly's Board, as we do in the present instance. Now, if these objections are well founded, the Christian public should feel them; for they are deeply interested in the result; and if they are destitute of foundation, the minds of those on whom they operate should be set to rest. Our object, therefore, demanded a public discussion. We are perfectly willing, that any one and every one who, upon careful and proper consideration, approves of the loaning system, of voluntary societies rendering themselves independent of public opinion by permanent funds, and election by ballot of their voting members, &c. &c., should join this Society, be he Presbyterian or Congregationalist, and press on its views and interests with all his heart. But we are, at the same time, desirous that those who with us, solemnly believe that these principles are fraught with evils to the best interest of the church, should not be borne on by the current, and brought to co-operate with a system, of which on maturer consideration, they would seriously disapprove.

We deeply regret that the Society or its friends should be grieved at the course which we have taken, but their complaining "loud and far and wide," we must think is not only unfounded, but amazingly injudicious. If we have misrepresented facts, we are open to conviction, and ready to make acknowledgement. If our objections are of no weight, let them be answered; but do not let us be condemned for appealing to the same tribunal to which the claims of the Society were submitted, and which alone is competent to decide in the case. We are glad, that the author of the Strictures does us the justice to admit, that we have avoided all *personality* and all imputation of improper motives; and we trust that if this discussion is to be continued, the same forbearance may be observed by the writers on both sides of the question. He complains, however, of our having sounded "the tocsin of alarm." If by this is meant presenting to our readers, a calm and dispassionate statement of our objections to the A. E. Society, then indeed have we sounded such an alarm. But let it be remembered, that the rousing character of the appeal depends entirely on the force of these objections. If they be of no weight, we have done the Society no harm, and have excited no apprehension. For it cannot be asserted, that we have dealt in mere insinuations, or empty declamation. As to his opinion (p. 65), that those members of the Presbyterian church, who approve of our former remarks, may have reason to regret having set such a precedent; we would only say, that when they appeal to the Christian public for the support of any of their institutions, they will never complain, that any individual (especially if he belong to the body of Christians to whom they apply for patronage,) should make a calm and Christian statement of his objections to their projects. If we have done more than this, we have done more than we intended; and we fear no reprisals in the spirit of the review complained of. The deep feeling, therefore, which the author confesses on the subject of an appeal to the Christian public, and which he says he entertains in common with many of the friends of the A. E. Society, we would do nothing to aggravate; while we earnestly maintain, that we have done nothing more than exercise a right, which we, in common with every other member of the Christian community, possess, and which we are persuaded, he would be one of the last men to wish to trammel in this free country. Such is our defence of the course which we have pursued.

The second point to which we would call the attention of our readers, is the minute details required of the beneficiaries of the Society, as to their receipts and expenditures. Though we consider this subject of importance, and are decided in our convictions of its inexpediency, it is the least prominent of all our objections. Our author, however, has devoted nearly ten pages to the defence of this part of the system. We object to it, because it is unnecessary, because it is injurious in its influence on character, and because it is exceedingly painful to young men of delicate and ingenuous feelings.

It is unnecessary, because all the information which it conveys may, as far as requisite, be obtained by less objectionable methods. It is argued, that as the Society is bound to ascertain the pecuniary circumstances and character of its beneficiaries, therefore this minute detail of all they receive, earn, or expend, is altogether necessary. We are fully aware of the responsibility which rests on the Society in this respect; the question is only as to the means adopted to discharge this part of their duty. We should suppose that the examining committees, by whom their beneficiaries are taken up, would be able to ascertain, with sufficient accuracy, the circumstances and character of the young men whom they adopt. This is the very purpose for which they are appointed; and if their duty be faithfully discharged, and the young men be worthy of confidence, there is little danger of deception. This is not theory on our part. We have seen this plan acted upon for years, and have never had reason to regret the want of this quarterly certified account from the young men, of every cent which they have received or expended. Our remarks, of course, do not apply to those who are so young, that their own parents would not trust them with the disposal of the funds requisite for their support. In such cases, their accounts may be kept, and presented by the Principal of the school to which they belong. According to our experience, therefore, this feature of the system of the A. E. Society is unnecessary, as far as ascertaining what the pecuniary wants of the individual really are. We have no doubt, that individual cases of deception will occur on every plan; but we do not think, that the whole system of the Society should be constructed on the supposition, that their beneficiaries will deceive them if they can. Our best security against such cases, is extreme caution as to the character of those whom we adopt. And it is certainly possible, as experience shows, to secure satisfactory evidence on this point, without having recourse to the plan objected to.

As to its being necessary to secure the confidence of the public, as our author argues, we would only say, that this is not the case with the public with which we are acquainted. Their confidence may be gained, by the character and vigilance of the men to whom this great concern is committed; and by the smallness of the amount appropriated to each individual.

Our second objection to this feature of the plan of the A. E. Society is, that we deem its influence on the character of the young men to be injurious. The author of the Strictures recommends it, as teaching them frugality, industry, &c., and says much on the evil of filling "the pockets of young men and boys with money, which is at their own disposal." But does the Reviewer recommend filling the pockets of young men and boys with money? Are any of the author's remarks on the blessings of poverty, and the evils of being rich, really to the point? Do we recommend making beneficiaries rich, or giving them the means of being extravagant? We are willing to adopt all the general remarks of the author, on this head, as our own; but we maintain, that a young man, who has a hundred dollars to maintain himself upon, in any of our Colleges or theological Seminaries, will not find himself rich, or raised above the necessity of exercising frugality, or of making personal exertions. As, therefore, the plan which we contemplate, and which we have seen long acted upon, with the most beneficial results, secures the advantages contemplated by the demand of minute quarterly returns, we are not disposed to close our eyes, to what we deem its necessary effect on the character of the young men. Our objection is not, that it makes the young men too economical; but that it proceeds on the principle of want of confidence in the young men themselves. You are afraid to trust them with seventy-two dollars a year, without requiring them to state, how they spend it, how much for tuition, how much for board, how much for washing, &c. &c., and to have it certified by their teacher, that this statement, to the best of his knowledge, is correct. Now we maintain, that where a man is old enough to take care of himself, and is considered worthy of being a candidate for the sacred office; all this is exceedingly derogatory. It wears out those feelings of delicacy and independence, which are among the most important natural elements of excellence of character. The way to make men worthy of confidence, is to treat them with confidence. The whole man is elevated by the good opinion and trust reposed in him, by those around him and above him. We deprecate, therefore, reducing young men to this constant feeling of dependence; this pressing upon them at every turn the idea of their subjection. As far as our experience extends, it is decidedly in favour of a more confidential and generous treatment of men destined to any important office. If they be not worthy of this confidence, they are not fit for the ministry. If they cannot be trusted with the disposal of seventy-two dollars a year, for their own support, who would trust them with the ministry of the Gospel?

There is, on page 39, a very great perversion, unintentional we do not doubt, of one of our former statements. We had said, that we knew of "more than one young man of unquestionable piety," who had declined asking aid from the A. E. Society on account of these quarterly returns. Our author represents the dread of *accountability*, as being the motive of their declining; and "cannot refrain from adding, that if *accountability* will deter any young man from asking aid, it is his earnest hope and wish that the A. E. Society may never have any beneficiaries of this character." It is not accountability, as such, from which young men shrink. It is the kind and nature of this accountability. If this be proper, then shrinking from it would justify the author's remark. But this is the very point at issue. Supposing this accountability extended to the way in which a man ate, or walked, how many words he spoke in a day, and a thousand particulars of like nature, and a young man should spurn at it; would it be proper to say, that 'he is afraid of accountability, we want no men who are not willing to be accountable?' This appears very much like throwing dust into the reader's eyes. We doubt not that the author of these Strictures, is willing to be responsible for the discharge of his duty. But supposing, that those to whom he is thus responsible, should require a quarterly certified return of every cent he spent, and every cent he gained; would he submit to it? Let it be understood then, that it is not an unwillingness to be open to any just and proper inspection, that we would represent the young men alluded to as entertaining. It is the nature and minuteness of the details which they would be required to present, at which their better feelings revolted. They felt that they were worthy of being trusted; and were unwilling to submit to a system, which seems to bear, on the very face of it, the implication, that they were not deserving of the slightest confidence.

Our third objection is, that young men of delicate and ingenuous minds, shrink from such a public development of their private concerns, and from this minute responsibility for all their receipts and expenditures. The statement of this objection has drawn down upon us, some of the severest remarks which our author has ventured to make. We do not intend replying to them with any warmth; but would merely state the grounds we have for making the remark, and vindicate the use of the word *public*, which has given so much offence. We say then, that as far as we have had any opportunity of learning the light in which this requisition is viewed by young men, it is with universal and strong dislike. Our author may object, that our opportunities of observation have been very imperfect. We reply, that in many respects our situation for getting at the truth, is much better than his own. In the first place, he sees in the general young men only from one section of the country, where the early habits and modes of thinking are less opposed to this principle, than in some other sections of our land. Secondly, he sees the official reports, as it were, of the young men, in which only what is favourable is expressed. We are far from saying, that no young man of delicate feelings would submit to this feature of the system. This is not the fair import of our language. We say that delicate and ingenuous feelings instinctively revolt against it. Does this imply that the 900 young men, who have submitted to it, are destitute of delicate and ingenuous feelings? By no means. Convince these young men (whatever may be their feelings) that it is their duty to submit to this requirement, and they will cheerfully submit. A sense of duty, and a desire to promote the Redeemer's kingdom, will make this, or any other burden, light. They would, from the same motives, act the part of the lowest menials. Their submitting to it, therefore, is no evidence that it was not revolting in its own nature. As long as the imposing character of those around them, and the general and confident opinion expressed in its favour, secures this conviction of its necessity in their own minds, you will hear no complaint. But take any young man of delicate feelings, who has not been thus taught, and thus influenced, and if his soul does not rise against it, we can put no confidence in the result of our own experience, or in the testimony of our own feelings. Our remark, therefore, cannot fairly be made to impeach, in the least, either the sensibility or sincerity of the numerous young men who are on the funds of the A. E. Society.

Our author predicts (p. 38,) that thousands in our country will understand, by the words "public development," that we meant to assert that the Schedules of all the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society are published to the world; and therefore says, that we are "accountable for an impression so much *at variance with the fact*, and tending to cast odium on the Directors of the A. E. Society," &c. He acquits us from the charge of intentional error, but remarks, "that when such great interests are concerned as are called in question here, men are bound to know that what they state as facts is correct." We must confess, that a glow of strong feeling passed over our minds when we read this paragraph. Have we then stated as a fact, that the Schedules of all the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society, are published to the world? Can the author really give the public credit for so little discernment, as to suppose, that they would understand us as meaning by "public development," in the connexion in which those words occur, that the quarterly accounts of 400 young men, are printed every three months and sent through the country? This would of itself require a volume. We assuredly, not only, had no intention of making this impression, but we never dreamed, that any man *could* suppose that any such thing was intended. If one man in ten thousand takes up this idea, from our remark, we shall be exceedingly surprised. There are surely different degrees of publicity. A thing is published, when made known in all nations, and in all languages; and it is published if made known in a village of a dozen houses. When a young man, therefore, is called upon to send in a statement of every cent gained or spent during the quarter; which goes to the President of his College; then to the Secretary and Directors of the Branch Society; then to the whole Board of the A. E. Society; and, in case of dispute, to the Society itself; it may, without any unauthorized use of language, be called a public development of private concerns. Had we committed an error, we should have thanked the author for the correction. But his putting a construction on our words, which is so foreign from their natural import, and then holding us up to the public, as accountable for a gross misrepresentation of facts, we confess, both surprised and pained us.

We come now to the third point, and that is the loaning system. This is a subject unconnected with any party or sectarian principles, and should, therefore, be calmly and seriously considered. We were on mature reflection opposed to this system, and felt prepared to present our reasons for this opposition, and consequently considered ourselves authorised to urge the adoption of it as one objection to the plan of the A. E. Society. What the author of these Strictures has said in its favour, the public may read and give it its due weight. Our objections are, 1. That it presents the whole subject in a wrong light. 2. That it exerts an injurious influence over the character of the young men. 3. That it tends to make the Society independent of public opinion. And 4. That it gives the Society a power over the destinies of the church, which no body of men ought to possess.

We say, that one objection to the loaning system is, that it presents the whole subject in a wrong light. Every one, who has the least acquaintance with our schools or colleges, knows, that it ever has been, and still is the case, that those who are educated on charitable funds, are regarded as degraded by their fellow students. Whatever may have been anticipated by its friends, we know that this is the fact, to a very painful extent, with regard to the beneficiaries of the A. E. Society. Now why is this? Mainly as we think, because the church has so generally looked upon her aid to these young men as *charities,* to which they were in no way entitled; and considered the favour as being altogether upon their part. The principle on which we would place this subject, is a very plain and broad one. Whenever any man devotes his whole time and talents to the service of any community, at their request, it is obligatory on that community to provide for his support. This is the principle on which all salaries are paid, whether in the state or church, or in literary institutions. It is the principle on which the apostle Paul argues, in 1 Cor. ix. to prove that they who preach the Gospel, should live by the Gospel, and which he shows is applied even to the brutes. It is the principle which our Saviour recognises, when he declares, that the labourer is worthy of his hire. It is recognised by every civilised government in the world, in regard to those who are in actual service, and to those who are preparing for it. If this principle be just, it applies as well to young men preparing for the ministry as to pastors. We can see no reason why the support of the one is more a matter of charity than that of the other. The adoption of this principle is pronounced by our author to be chimerical and impossible. He argues that it proves too much; that it would require the church to support the rich, as well as indigent candidates for the ministry. We would ask, whether the rich and poor are not already *educated* gratuitously in all our theological Seminaries; and whether the church considers this an unreasonable burden? Surely not. But on what principle is this done? Certainly on the one stated above. If it be asked, whether we wish to see all the candidates for the ministry supported at public expense, as the cadets are at West Point? We answer no, simply because it is unnecessary, and because we find it difficult to obtain funds sufficient to maintain those who cannot support themselves. We are glad to see young men devoting themselves to the church, and preparing themselves for the service of Christ, at their own expense; and we should be glad to see the rich preaching the Gospel gratuitously to those who had no means of requiting them. We cannot see the force of our author's other objection, that it would be necessary to tax the members of the church, in proportion to their wealth, if this principle were adopted. Why is it not necessary to tax the members of the church for the salaries of the pastors? Are not the contributions for this purpose VOLUNTARY? Do not the poor often pay more in proportion than the rich? Is there any necessity for a church establishment, or for the interference of the civil power to collect these salaries? No. The power, which secures these free and cheerful contributions, lies in the self-evident principle which we have stated above. It is a matter of natural justice, as well as of divine authority, that the labourer is worthy of his hire. We desire no church establishment, to make those who love the Gospel, contribute to its support. And no such establishment, and no civil power is requisite to make them give voluntarily and gladly to support those, who offer themselves to carry this Gospel to the destitute. We are sorry that our author can think the plan suggested, and acted upon already to so great an extent, chimerical. If however "what proves too much, proves nothing" as he says, he must either withdraw this objection, or maintain that taxation and compulsion are necessary for the support of the Gospel. It has been suggested, that on this plan, the church would be liable to imposition, by those whom she had educated for her service turning aside to some other avocation. If it be thought necessary to guard against the possibility of such an evil, conditional bonds might be given, as in many instances has been done, that the money shall be repaid if the individual fail to enter on his work. For ourselves, however, we would rather seek our security in the hearts and consciences of the young men themselves. We are no advocates of bonds.

We are anxious to see the principle, which we have advanced, and which we know is recognised by some of the wisest and best men in our country, fully recognised by the church; because it would, at once, disenthral our young men. We have seen enough to know how severely they feel being regarded as charity students, and how injuriously the state of things in most of our Colleges operates upon their character. The loaning system proceeding, as we think, upon a wrong principle, we know from observation, and testimony, does not help the matter at all. A young man, who feels himself standing on the ground which we have assumed, and knowing that it is recognised as just, by those around him, loses entirely the degrading feeling of dependence. He voluntarily tenders his life and talents to the church, and is voluntarily, yea gladly accepted. The debt is mutual; and he recognises his obligation to consecrate his all, to advance the best interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, exactly as the faithful minister now does.

If these remarks be well founded, the loaning system is radically wrong. It is unjust in principle; as much so as it would be to make every servant of the civil or religious public, refund their several salaries. It is indeed a plain principle of justice, that where a compensation is given, service should be rendered; but we contend, that in the case before us, an equivalent is found in the devotion of the time and talents of the candidate to the service of the church; and if this be so, it is oppressive to burden him with debt. We greatly lament the adoption of the loaning system by the A. E. Society, because it tends to perpetuate and confirm the evils, of which we have already spoken, and which are so sensibly felt by our most valuable young men, and which will always be felt, until this subject is viewed in a different light from that in which this system presents it.

If it be asked, whether we consider young men, educated by the church, as under no obligation to return the money expended on their preparation for the ministry? We would answer, that our view of this subject is, that every such man, and every other man, who enters the ministry, is bound to do all he can, for the cause of Christ. If the education cause be the loudest and most imperious in its calls, let him devote his resources and his efforts in that direction. If there be most need, in the time and place where his lot is cast, to advance the cause of missions, let this command his money and his time. We consider the return as made in devoting *himself*, with all he is and has, to the service of his Master. More than this, the church should neither wish nor require.

Our second objection to the loaning system is, its injurious effect upon the character.

On this subject we shall say but little, as much that might be here introduced has already been hinted at. We deprecate the influence of DEBT, on the moral feelings and peace of young men. We all know what this influence is; how much it interferes with the comfort, and even with the improvement and usefulness of the individual. We regret, therefore, to see this harassing load systematically laid upon a great portion of our ministers. We know, and we knew before, that the Directors of the A. E. Society have a dispensing power. But we are sure that this remedy cannot reach the evil. They cannot tell how much of embarrassment and difficulty, in every case, will justify them in cancelling the bonds, which they may hold. Whatever may be their kind feelings, the young men (we are speaking from facts, and not from theory, as our author seems constantly to imagine), feel the load. It presses on their minds during their preparatory course, and stares them in the face the moment they commence their work. We have known instances, in which their anxiety to rid themselves of this pressure, has led them at once to ask, where most money was to be gained, and shape their course accordingly. This, though not an universal, nor even we trust, a general result, is still a very natural one; which has occurred, and doubtless often will occur again. But supposing, that a young man resists this first temptation, still the debt follows him, and will soon begin to accumulate. Every one knows, that in the vast majority of situations, in which ministers of the Gospel are placed in our country, it must be a difficult task to support themselves and families. Or to quote our author's own words when speaking of the necessity of frugality; "it is absolutely certain that their salary, in any ordinary case, will never be adequate, without the strictest economy, to their wants," (p. 35.) A remark which he appears strangely to have forgotten, when he is arguing to prove that any young man of industry and good talents, may without difficulty discharge a debt of from four to six or seven hundred dollars. We say then, if our author's statement, that in any ordinary case, the salary of a minister will not be adequate to his wants, without the strictest economy, is true, this debt in all ordinary cases must be a harassing and painful load. We know an instance in which a Society adopted the loaning plan, and fixed on five years, as the term in which the moneys advanced were to be repaid. But it was found necessary to extend the period to seven years; and it is now contemplated to abandon the system entirely. Until this debt is paid, a young man is never free. He has, with regard to every dollar that comes into his hand, to debate the question, what is to be done with it? Shall I employ it for my own use, or for some benevolent purpose, or must I lay it aside for the A. E. Society? Any man who has felt the misery of this perpetual anxiety to get rid of pecuniary obligations, will not readily consent to subject the ministry, as a body, to its temptations and its sufferings.

Our third objection to the loaning system, is, that it tends to make the Society independent of public opinion.

It is a matter of vast consequence, that our voluntary Societies should be religiously strict on this point. They should be so organised that their existence may depend on the approbation of the Christian public; so that, if at any time they should abuse their trust, they may lose their power. It is evident, that any Society which has its income from permanent funds of large amount, and which is able to secure the refunding of all moneys advanced, is just so far independent of public opinion. Should it abuse the confidence reposed in it, its power does not cease. It may, in defiance of the known wishes of the donors of these funds, employ them for the propagation of the most destructive opinions. In the case before us, if any one will take the trouble of calculating the income which may be derived from the reimbursements of the former beneficiaries of the Society, and from its permanent funds; he will find that before many years are past, it will have at its disposal an immense annual sum, which must flow into its hands, whatever may be the character which the institution shall then sustain. We object to a system which renders the Society thus independent. We refer, for a contrast, to the American Home Missionary Society. This noble institution, as appears from the declaration of its friends and officers, and from its annual reports, has made it a sacred purpose to keep itself dependent on public approbation. If it forfeits this, it ceases to exist. If it becomes a party engine, it loses the support of all but its own partisans. But let the A. E. Society become a party engine, and it retains all its resources derived from its loans and permanent funds. If it be said, that this is equally true, of any and every Society throughout the land, we are not disposed to admit the correctness of the assertion. Compare, for a moment, the organization of the A. E. Society with that of the A. H. Missionary Society. The two features of electing by ballot its voting members, and its refunding system, will be seen to make an immense difference, as to the liability to perversion. Supposing that at any annual meeting of the A. H. Missionary Society, there should be a majority of members present, in favour of a party application of its funds and influence, what would be the consequence? Certainly not, that the Society was irretrievably lost. For such a party has no means of securing their ascendency; and if they had, depending on annual contributions, they would lose the support of all who did not concur in their views. The case is evidently far different with the A. E. Society. Let any casual majority assembled at an annual meeting, though not constituting a fifth of the whole number of voting members, be agreed as to any particular application of the power of the Society, and it is entirely in their hands. They can bring in what number of members they please of similar views, and thus secure their ascendency. Their income, however, derived from permanent funds and loans, continues to flow in undiminished. Will any man say there is no difference between these two cases? Let it be remembered that twenty constitute a quorum of the Society.* Then eleven men may be a controlling majority, who at any annual meeting may get this whole immense concern into their own hands. Let it be further recollected, that the Directors are voting members of the Society, and are thirteen in number, and it will be seen, that it may easily happen, that the Board itself may constitute a commanding majority of the Society, though its members are scattered over twenty States, and number three hundred and fifty. Can our author, or any one else, now say, that this Society is no more liable to perversion than any other Society throughout the world? We must repeat it, (that it may not be imagined that we acquiesce at all in the conclusiveness of our author's confident reply,) that all his arguments to show, that the Directors are accountable to the Society, are nothing to the point. The author himself, (p. 55,) seems to see that it is the power of the Society, and not merely of the Directors, to which we object. For he says, "The Reviewer is afraid of the immense power which the *Parent Society* will ultimately attain :" and yet he attempts to allay our fears, by saying that the Directors are accountable to the Society! And he further hopes and believes, that we will be so satisfied with such an answer, that we will withdraw even the insinuation of an objection. It is the Society itself, of which twenty members constitute a quorum, that we maintain is more liable to perversion than any Society in the whole country, with which we have the least acquaintance. "Can an imagination which is not heated, see any phantoms of a frightful aspect rising up out of such ground as this?" Our author would not, we presume, have ventured to ask this question, had he seen, at the time, our objection in its true light. At any rate, we are willing to admit, that our imaginations are heated enough to see such phantoms, and it will require some more potent spell than the foregoing article, to lay them. Look now, to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; one of the most noble institutions of this or of any other land, and one of all others affording perhaps the least temptation to abuse. They elect their own members; but have they thought proper to render themselves independent of public opinion? Their permanent funds are so insignificant, that they could hardly live a month, without the contributions of the Christian community.

---

* See Constitution, Art. XI.

If our author be disposed "to turn the tables," and ask how it is with the General Assembly, we would answer, that he entirely misconceives and consequently (from necessity) misrepresents our former remarks on this subject. If the General Assembly were a permanent body, electing its own members, we should be as much opposed to its independence, as we are to that of the Society in question. But this is not the case. It is a transient body. It lives but a few weeks. It is changed every year. Hardly six individuals are in one, who were members of the preceding. If all the permanent funds, and all the influence of this body, were at the mercy of any casual majority, which might be found in any one Assembly, the church might well tremble for the consequence. An insignificant minority of the Presbyterian body, might then become the masters of all the institutions and funds endowed and collected by their pious fathers. Can any one pretend that the General Assembly would be as secure, were this its organization, as it is at present; the mere creature of the Presbyteries, and of necessity their representative? If not, then no one can pretend, that the funds of the A. E. Society are as secure as those of the latter body. It is not in our "Confession and Formulas of discipline and doctrine," as our author would seem to imagine, that we place our security. It is, under God, in the organization of the General Assembly, as a body elected by the church generally. It is utterly impossible that these funds should be perverted, until the church itself becomes corrupt. Whereas, unless we are utterly mistaken, (and if we are, let it be proved,) it is only necessary that a mere majority at an annual meeting of the A. E. Society, (which need not exceed twenty in number), should be, not absolutely heretical, but party men, such as good men often are, and the power of this institution is in their hands. We must think, therefore, that our author's declaration is exceedingly bold, "that the A. E. Society is no more liable to future dangers, than every Society and every Seminary in the country and throughout the world." Let the public compare its organization with that of any of the bodies mentioned above, and then judge. Η ἡμέρα δηλώσει.

Our fourth objection to the loaning and refunding system is, the undue power which it puts into the hands of the Society.

Here let be distinctly understood, that we are not speaking of the *use*, which the Society or its Board have already made, or do now desire to make of their influence. Our argument is simply, that according to its present organization, and on its present plan, this Society must possess an influence over the destinies of the church, which no body of men ought to have. The beneficiaries and the Society here stand in the relation of debtors and creditors. The latter have, therefore, over the former, all the influence which results from this relation. They have that ascendency over the mind, which it always gives, to a greater or less extent, according to individual character and circumstances. The Parent Society, by being the recipient of all moneys repaid, and the holders of all the bonds which are given, are the main depositaries of this power. Now what is this power? It is the power of dictating to a large proportion of the pious youth of our country, in what Academy, College, or theological Seminary, they shall pursue their studies. It is the power of raising or depressing any institution throughout the land. It is the power of deciding, under what theological influence, our future ministers are to be formed. It is the power of holding and influencing these ministers, as bondmen, when they come out into the church. It is the power of saying, to some five or six or eight hundred Presbyterian ministers, (as before many years will be the case), do this, and we will cancel your bonds—do this, and you must pay them. This is a power, which we should deprecate in the hands of any set of men on earth. We should rebel against it in the hands of the General Assembly's Board, as soon and as decidedly as in those of the A. E. Society. It is what we never would submit to. We protest against this subjugation of the future ministry of the country, to any corporation, Presbyterian or Congregational. If any portion of our brethren are willing to bind themselves and their successors in such chains, we are not of the number. We are disposed to demand that our ministers should be free men; that they should come into the ministry unshackled. Nothing can ever reconcile us to a system which gives such power to any set of men, and we do not believe that the Christian public will bear it. We would, with all due deference, be FREE, and have our children free.

It cannot, as it seems to us, be denied that the A. E. Society has this power. We know that some of its officers, to a certain extent at least, admit it. But it is answered, that they will not abuse it, and all objections on this head are set down to the score of "fears"! Our reply is, that admitting the present officers of the Society to be so high-minded and just, (and we are not disposed to call this in question,) as to permit this mighty engine to remain untouched; we ask, have we any reason, from the past or present history of the church, to believe that it will or can long continue thus unemployed? Are there not men now, and good men too, in all parts of the country, and of all kinds of opinion, who could bring themselves to believe it to be right, to use this power, in promoting what they honestly think the truth; who would be glad to have, and to employ the power of saying, to half the candidates for the ministry in the country, study here or study there? We know not how it is elsewhere, but we see instances every day, in which this influence is exerted by Education Societies. We know that this is the fact, and we know that the use of power is so natural a result of the possession of it, that we are disposed to demur, when any set of men say to us, 'let us bind you hand and foot, we promise not to hurt you.'

When our author demands (p. 62,) in substance, whether our young men and ministers are so destitute of moral rectitude and independence, as to allow themselves to be swayed by mere pecuniary considerations? it is enough to reply, that ministers are men, and that all experience shows that it is not necessary, that a man should be destitute of moral principle to be influenced by such motives. *The rich ruleth over the poor, and* THE BORROWER IS SERVANT TO THE LENDER, Prov. xxii. 7.

But the tables may again be turned, and the demand made, what will be the influence of the General Assembly's Board? We answer, on their plan next to nothing. They are not creditors. They retain no bonds in their hands. They send their students into the church unshackled. Were it otherwise, could this Board bring into the Assembly some forty or fifty men, who were their debtors; though the case would still be far different from that of the A. E. Society, the church never would submit to it. It should, however, be recollected, that though the Board of the Assembly stands to the Assembly itself, in the same relation that the Board of the A. E. Society, does to the Society, yet that Society holds a very different relation to the churches, from that sustained by the Assembly. The former perpetuates itself, the latter is annually appointed. The power of the one may be obtained and secured by a diminutive minority of its own members; that of the other *must* remain with the majority of the whole church. But notwithstanding this plain and palpable difference between the two cases, we should protest against any such power being vested in the Assembly's Board. If it be asked, whether they cannot still exercise a controlling influence over all their young men, as to where their opinions and character are to be formed, we would again reply, that even if this were the fact, the difference would still be immense, between this case and that of the A. E. Society, on the ground just stated. But we go further, and say that we are opposed to any such organization, as would give that Board the power of directing the course of all the young men of the Presbyterian church; we wish to see this business left where it naturally belongs, to the several Presbyteries, to which these young men appertain.

We do not believe that any unprejudiced mind can contemplate this subject, without feeling the force of this objection; without being convinced, that there is a power concentered in the A. E. Society, on its present plan, to which the churches ought not to submit. And let it be remarked, that this power results from its peculiar organization, and from the system of loans; and that neither of these features is essential to its influence, or usefulness. It might on the usual plan, pursue its elevated object, with the same efficiency, without endangering the purity and liberty of the church. It should also be remembered, that this power is of all others, most liable to perversion. It is not necessary, as before stated, that the majority of this Society should become Universalists or Socinians, to lead them to abuse the trust reposed in them. Let them feel and act, as many good men now do, and they will not hesitate to employ their influence in promoting their own views, whatever they may be. We would not trust a body of men in Philadelphia with this power, any sooner than a body in Boston. It is the principle to which we object, and which we believe to be utterly inconsistent with the best interests of the church.

There is another remark, which it may be proper to make. This Society is a national Society, striving to become such in fact, as well as in name. Were its object attained, it would have the whole of the unspeakably important business of forming the character of our ministers, in its power. The destinies of the whole church would be in their hands; in the hands of every majority of voting members of the A. E.

Society assembled at any annual meeting. Is this right? Is this safe? Are the churches willing to deliver up their fate to any set of men in this manner? Let the theological Seminary at Princeton, as our author suggests, become corrupt. We have still Auburn, and Andover, and Hampden Sidney, and Pittsburgh, to pour forth their streams of pure and living truth. But let the A. E. Society, (should it ever be what it styles itself, the American Society,) become corrupt, and what have we left?

We have written with earnestness, because we have "a deep feeling" on this subject. But we have studiously avoided any imputation of motives. We have reasoned on principles; our arguments are on broad grounds; let them have their due force and no more; but do not let it be insinuated that our motives are party or sectarian. We have, indeed, no fear that this will be done, by any man of impartiality and candour.

Those of our readers, who in any measure concur in the views which we have advanced, will now see reason enough, why we chose to bring this subject before the churches. They will see and feel that it is a subject which ought not to be hushed up; that the churches have a right to know, what any of their members deem the inevitable consequences of an union with the A. E. Society on its present plan. They are free to act for themselves; but surely *they* are not to be blamed, who venture to reason with them, on a subject in which their dearest interests, and those of their children are involved. Our author says, that he believes, and may say he knows, that there are many, very many members of the Presbyterian church, who never will, and never can approve, either of our arguments or of the manner of bringing them forward. This may be. But we know that there are many, *very many*, who approve of both. We are persuaded that our author and his friends, will find themselves disappointed, if they imagine that these are party objections, or peculiar to any one class of men.

We come now to the charge of misrepresentation and ignorance.

As we are charged with making "to popular feeling," an appeal, which has for its basis a view of facts altogether imperfect, and in many respects entirely erroneous;" (p. 65.) and as the charge of ignorance of the principles and proceedings of the A. E. Society, and of assertions at variance with facts, is repeated again and again in the Strictures,* it may be expected, that we should maintain the correctness of our former positions, or confess our errors, and return thanks for the information received.

To confess our errors, when clearly pointed out, is perfectly consistent with the spirit that dictated the remarks which have brought on us the above accusations. We had, and still have the fullest conviction, of the importance of the sacred end proposed to be attained—the education of indigent pious young men for the ministry of the Gospel. And it was with extreme reluctance we admitted the evidence, which the Constitution and Rules of said Society seemed to present, that the means adopted were likely to result in lasting injury to the cause intended to be advanced. Even now, unless we mistake our own feelings, we should be happy to retract whenever an error in the facts alleged, or in the conclusions drawn from them, is discovered, regardless of the manner of language employed to convince us of our mistakes. But unless we are greatly deceived, we cannot be schooled *ex cathedra* into the admission of facts not fully substantiated, and of reasonings not bringing conviction to our understanding. To some of the allegations, we have given our answer in the preceding remarks respecting the quarterly returns, and the system of loans. Two items, one under each of the heads just named, remain to be noticed.

Speaking of the Schedules, the author of the Strictures says, (p. 37.) "In this way the Directors come to the knowledge of facts which serve to meet assertions like that of the Reviewer, when he says that the aid afforded by the A. E. Society, is not sufficient to meet half the expense of an education in the cheapest College in the United States. The answer to this is, that it does not comport with *facts* thus disclosed." We regret that so much of these reports has not been published, as would inform us where these Colleges are to be found, which afford the advantages of an education on terms so accommodating. It might have prevented us doing injustice to the A. E. Society, and it would be very useful to young men seeking an education on easy terms. All we wish to say is, that we are yet ignorant of any College where a young man can pay boarding, tuition, and other necessary expenses, and purchase clothing, with any thing like seventy-two dollars a year, and the profits of his own industry. We know cases where benevolent individuals have subscribed seventy-five dollars annually for seven years, in expectation of preparing a young man for the ministry with that sum. And such individuals have selected young men destitute of property and of friends able to aid them, have placed them in an Academy where the students labour part of the time for their own support; and before the year closed, the benefactors of such young men have been called on for pretty large additions to the allowance made by the Society to such students; and we venture to predict, that the same demand will, with just cause, be made in every stage of their preparatory course—that additional aid must be received from some source. We freely admit that some young men, in particular circumstances, do obtain an education with even less aid than that afforded by the A. E. Society. These are exceptions to the general rule, and ought not to be brought forward as proofs of what may be done by all young men, of a character suitable to enter the Gospel ministry. We have no objections to young men endeavouring to help themselves, and we would afford them every facility to do so. But with their best exertions, in ordinary cases, the sum given by the A. E. Society is too small. It is in vain the Society talk of giving their beneficiaries a complete education, if they are compelled to labour or teach school one half the time, in order to support themselves the other. Just look at the case. What is the clear annual gain of an industrious and economical mechanic, or teacher of a common school, or labourer, after maintaining himself? Not in ordinary cases more than fifty dollars, and often less; and yet a young man without a trade, is expected to support himself with the profits of industry in hours of relaxation from study. If their tuition be free, or they receive aid from other sources than their own industry, our argument is still valid.

---

* See pp. 38, 39—40, 46, 58, 65.

In page 39, the author of the Strictures has given another specification of the "altogether imperfect and in some respects entirely erroneous views," on which he conceives we build our conclusions. We had said, that the reasons for introducing the loaning system were two; and stated what they were, and endeavoured to refute them. Our author alleges we have omitted an important reason given in the Eleventh Annual Report of the Society. Some would say we were not bound to give all the reasons for adopting the measure, but only those to which we object. But we disclaim such a reply, and simply say, we did think and do still think that it was from the *smallness* of the loan, and not from the *loan itself*, that the Directors anticipated a happy influence on the character of those they patronise. We will not waste words on this point, but refer our readers to the Eleventh Annual Report of the A. E. Society, and let them judge for themselves.

We proceed to consider another part of what our author calls, an examination of facts alleged in regard to the measures and principles of the A. E. Society. The subject is thus introduced: "But the Reviewer asks, What becomes of the moneys when refunded? He goes on to aver that they are all returned to the treasury of the Parent Society; and that in consequence of such an arrangement, this Society will finally have an unlimited capital at their exclusive control. Add all the loans returned to the permanent funds and to the Scholarships, and he thinks in half a century a height of independence must be obtained, sufficient to make even good men's heads turn giddy." (p. 19.) In particular he suggests, that if all the Presbyterian churches in the United States were to become auxiliary to the A. E. Society, the moneys refunded by all the beneficiaries as well as their annual surplus, must go to the Parent Board, and *be entirely beyond the reach of the Branches*," (p. 19.)

"I shall not take the liberty to impute any special design to the writer, in this appeal." "The correctness of the principles and the assertions, on which it is grounded, are proper subjects of examination," (p. 46.) We request our readers to remember what is proposed to be done—not *to impute any special design* to the writer; but to *examine the correctness of the principles and assertions on which this appeal is grounded.* In what way would a man of plain understanding suppose this examination would be conducted? Would he not suppose that the assertions which lie at the bottom of the business, should first be shown to be false, and then the conclusion, or appeal, or whatever it may be called, would fall to the ground as a matter of course? But this method did not seem good to our author. He lets *the assertions* alone, and begins with telling us how anxious the Directors have been to secure the funds against perversion or monopoly—what means have been used to effect this object—who the men are that constitute the General Society—the number of members—in how many States they reside—why there are so few Presbyterians—where the Society originated—what originally constituted membership—when and why a change in obtaining membership was made. He goes on to tell us how much money was raised in N. England during the first ten years—how much in Massachusetts—how many members have been elected since the change in the constitution—how many in N. England—how few in Massachusetts—how many in the States of N. York, N. Jersey and Pennsylvania. And then asks, "Does this look like local partiality? Or is there any party ambition or purposes discoverable in this?" He then gives some important information to the Reviewer and his friends, and in order that they may not overlook it, underscores his words. He goes on to console Presbyterians with the hope that they will soon have a controlling influence in the A. E. Society. He then tells us the measures of the Directors are revised by the Society, and that the Board is elected only for one year. He then takes another view of the subject, and shows us another check imposed on the Board by means of the Branch Societies. Again, that the whole is so nicely organized, and the parts balanced by mutual checks, that it is "not unlike what the structure of our National Government exhibits." And further, goes on commenting on the constitution of the Society two more pages. And finally, from the review of the constitution and principles of the Parent and Branch Societies draws his conclusion in these words—"it seems to me quite impossible, that any partial or party appropriations of moneys, should be made by the Directors of the Parent Society," &c. (p. 50.)

After he has persuaded himself, that funds to any amount are perfectly safe in the hands of his friends, and their successors, he admits every thing that the Reviewer had *asserted* respecting the moneys refunded, and surplus funds going into the treasury of the Parent Society. Now what has become of the *assertions* proposed to be examined? What has he said to invalidate *the averments*? After leading us to expect that some error would be pointed out, he has not condescended to give us one instance.

The object of the Reviewer in the article under consideration, was to show the stupendous power and even independence which the General Society, by means of loans returned, surplus and permanent funds and scholarships, might attain, if the scheme proceeded. And our author having spoken, in the commencement of his Strictures on this article, of assertions and averments, and led his readers to imagine some erroneous statement had been made, gives us a long dissertation on the constitution, with a view to show that the Directors must obey the will of a majority of the Society. This argument, as far as it has force, is applicable to the third objection, and not to that under consideration.

We say, the Society itself may become a party engine, and the Directors be the agents to execute the party purposes of a majority of the General Society.

Let it be noted, that the author of the Stricture does not deny or attempt to disprove the *assertions* of the Reviewer, respecting the power and independence of the Society. Indeed he could not. For as early as May 1827, soon after the connexion with the Presbyterian Branch was formed, the Directors, having spoken of the establishment of scholarships and increase of funds during the preceding year, exult in the prospect before them. "It has," say they, "not only saved the Society from great embarrassment and from more serious evils, *but has placed it upon a basis where with the common blessing of God, it will stand for ages to come, increasing in resources and influence.*" XI. Report, p. 14.

So confident are we that the merits of the question have not been fairly and fully met by our author, that we request the reader who doubts, to look at the review from the middle of p. 18 to the same part of p. 19. Let it be remembered too, that the power and independence of the Society are the grounds on which we apprehend danger. If the Society were not thus powerful and independent, the checks of which the author speaks would be amply sufficient. We ask no other security than he has given us, from a Society, which is annually dependent for its support on the liberality of the public. But not so in regard to a Society, which has means to go on, if every individual, except its members, should raise a voice against it. The security arising from the mode of electing Directors, on which our author relies with so much confidence, we shall notice hereafter.

But it seems that after the requiem sung to our "fears," the author himself has some apprehensions lest the Branch Societies will not be fully satisfied. "If," says he, "for the sake of convenience, however, the General Society should adopt a plan, which would allow the moneys *returned* within the limits of each Branch Society, to be paid into the treasury of such Society, this measure would remove even the semblance of the difficulty which the Reviewer suggests. The Directors, I have no doubt, will be disposed to adopt this, or any other arrangement which may promote the interests of the Society." (p. 51.)

We are gratified with this concession. It is worth all the attention we have given to the subject. And although we would not wish to press too far those who are disposed to be accommodating, we would suggest another arrangement, viz. that the moneys refunded, as well as the surplus funds, be kept in the treasuries of the Branch Societies, until their own Directors dispose of them at their own discretion. It is possible the Branch Societies at no distant day, may think their own Directors competent to decide, if they have no beneficiaries within their limits, whether they should send their surplus funds to the East or to the West, to the North or to the South.

We now proceed to notice the security which our author thinks he finds in the mode of choosing Directors and Officers of the Society, and in the revision which the Society, at its annual meetings, exercises over all the acts of the Board.

We have given offence by saying that according to the mode of doing business at the annual meetings, the Directors might, if they pleased, exert an influence in choosing new members and in the election of a new Board. Our author rebukes us for such an intimation, and that we might not again fall into a similar mistake, says, "I repeat it, in order that neither the Reviewer nor his friends may overlook it; *The Directors neither nominate nor choose any of the elected members of the Society*." (p. 47.)

Let the reader now turn to page 20, of our former article, he will there find these words, "Suppose that at any time, a majority of the acting members of the Society, is in favour of the measures adopted by the Directors, the Directors can, *through their friends*, have new voting members chosen favourable to the same course, &c." Do we here say that the Directors as such, either nominate or choose new members? Surely not. We say, that, from the nature of the case, they can, if so disposed, exert an influence in this business. Is this objection met by saying, and underscoring, that the Directors have no official right of appointing the new members? Our author, therefore, is mistaken when he says (p. 51,) that our objection to the influence of the Directors, "is built on misapprehension of the Constitution and Rules of the A. E. Society." Our objection is, in the first place, that the A. E. Society has a power of dangerous extent; in the second place, that the Directors, of necessity as the organs of the Society, hold and exercise this power; and that their accountability to the Society is no adequate security, because, besides other reasons elsewhere urged, they have the main direction of the Society itself, and can, if so disposed, influence the election of new members as well as the decision of other matters. We would appeal to the Minutes of the twelfth annual meeting held in the city of New-York, May 8, 1828, to prove that in point of fact, the Directors have this influence.

The published Minute is as follows, viz. "The Rev. Dr Porter of Andover, the Rev. Dr Spring and Arthur Tappan, Esq. of New-York were appointed a committee to *nominate* new members for admission into this Society." XII. Annual Report, p. 3. We have no fault to find with the worthy gentlemen appointed on this *nominating* committee. We would rejoice if our country and the church had ten thousand such men. Nor do we find fault with the *nomination* made. Our simple object is, to account for our former error, in supposing there was nothing in the Constitution or mode of conducting the election of new members, to prevent the Directors, if they were so disposed, having some influence in the selection of voting members, who are to review the proceedings of the former Board, and to choose a new one.

In looking at the Minutes of the previous Annual meeting held in Boston, May 28, 1827, it will be seen that all the gentlemen on the *nominating* committee, were Directors. XI. Report, p. 4. And from the Minutes of the meeting at which these *nominations* were made, it appears that the gentlemen on the *nominating* committee were re-elected Directors for the following year. We have not said and we do not now say that the nomination of new members is an official act of the Directors: but we do say the Directors have *de facto* an influence in nominating and choosing new members, who are to choose new Directors and to review the proceedings of those whose term of office has expired. Now what security have we that the Society will exercise a vigilant control over the proceedings of the Board of Directors? The checks as described by our author appeared admirable, rendering it almost impossible that the Directors can do amiss, without a speedy retribution; but now we see that the mode of conducting elections gives them a good opportunity to escape. Let us not be understood as suggesting, that there was any improper management in the transaction referred to. Positively we do not. We only mean to justify our former positions, and to show that we are not the only persons who write about important concerns without correct information.

But independent of such examples, which may be said to be casual, we maintain on general principles, that the Directors of all voluntary associations have, almost invariably, an influence in directing all the measures of the Societies to which they belong. They know the interests of the Society, whose concerns they manage, and it is natural, and in most cases proper, that members of the Society who are less acquainted with the details of the business, should pay great respect to the opinions and wishes of those actively engaged in the management of the concern. This is the fact in all voluntary Societies, of which we have any knowledge. And when there is no temptation to abuse, as is the case in other associations, no evils result, but many advantages.

But supposing the General Society can, and does exercise a vigilant control over the proceedings of the Directors, what is there to prevent a small majority of the Society, happening to be present at a single annual meeting, from creating, at a single ballot, voting members sufficient to maintain the ascendency ever afterwards? All that our author says about the probability, that members of the Presbyterian church will soon constitute a majority of the whole Society, does not in the least allay our "fears." There are, and may be other parties besides Congregational and Presbyterian. We fully agree with our author, that these are small matters; and we hope the day is far distant, when disputes on this subject will occasion any serious difficulties. We do not pretend to say, what will be the subject of dispute. We know there are many things, respecting which intelligent men, and good men do differ, and probably will hereafter differ. We do not pretend to say, what may give the line of division its direction. The probability that such a diversity of opinion will exist, is sufficient for our present purpose. And there is no subject on which jealousies are so likely to arise, as respecting the education of young men for the ministry of the Gospel. It is seen, that they will influence the opinions and doctrines of the churches, and therefore it becomes an object of intense interest, to every party man, that those he aids in educating, should be taught in his own school. The grace of God has never yet entirely extinguished these feelings; and even less matters have a tendency to create difficulties on this subject. We all have our local partialities, our social attachments, and our early associations; and we do not know that we would be better men, or better Christians, if we had not. It requires an effort, a constant effort, to prevent these feelings swaying us when great interests are at stake.

Now is it not probable, that from these, or other causes, parties will spring up in a Society extending over so large a territory, and embracing men, who agree in fundamental truths, but differ in smaller matters? The majority, it is true, decides every question at annual meetings; but they may decide on party grounds, and wield the immensely powerful engine in their hands, to put down their brethren who differ from them. In our voluntary associations, which are truly American, such as the Bible and Tract Societies, and Board of Foreign Missions, and some others, none of these difficulties exist, or at most in a very small degree. But in the case before us, they will operate, and we think we do not express ourselves too strongly, when we say no human hand can prevent so powerful an engine as the A. E. Society, from bearing on one party or another; and if it were in the hands of the Presbyterian church to-morrow, it would not change our opinion.

We are told, that in the management of every great concern there must be power, and that power may be abused. That the officers of our national government may abuse the confidence reposed in them. True, but in the two cases there is this remarkable difference: The officers of the government are responsible to the people; the members of this Society are not responsible to the great body of the church. Our author has said, the organization of this Society is "not unlike what the structure of our national government exhibits." Here again we beg leave to differ. We conceive the resemblance would be more complete, if our national Constitution were so changed, that the existing members of Congress were authorized to choose their own co-members and successors, and to appoint the Executive, Heads of Departments, Judges, and all subordinate officers, and to leave the people the privilege of paying their taxes, and of being governed by the laws made and provided for them. If the change suggested were made in our national Constitution, the cases would be nearly parallel. The A. E. Society chooses its own co-members and successors, elects its Directors and officers, receives from the church its funds, and sends her such pastors as the Society and its Branches choose to educate. It may be said, the Presbyteries, Associations, and Councils, may refuse to ordain them. True; but where can they find means of educating any other, as the funds necessary for this purpose are all thrown into one great channel? Will it be said, that the voting members of the Society bear a greater proportion to the church, than the members of Congress do to the people?—Very true. But when we consider that the attendance of the members of Congress is better than that of the Society, and that twenty members are a quorum to do business, the difference is not so great as appears at first view.

Our determination, when we first cast our eyes on our author's second general head of "fears," was simply to say—Remove the dangers which the Reviewer has pointed out, and his fears will subside as a natural consequence. But on examining the contents of this division of the subject, we noticed many things which caused the most deep and poignant regret. We noticed what indeed might be called "sounding the tocsin of alarm, and appealing to popular feeling and party prejudice." We could not persuade ourselves that a writer of our author's distinguished acuteness and ability, would permit himself to make this outcry, unless some palpable cause had been given by the Reviewer. On looking at the detached extracts, selected as the ground of his remarks, there appeared to be some foundation for the appeal which followed.

On the other hand, from our personal knowledge of the views and feelings of the Reviewer, confident that he had never taken an active part in the disputes that have sometimes arisen on these subjects, and believing, that although a Presbyterian, he felt no jealousies or ill will towards his Congregational brethren, we could not persuade ourselves that he had said any thing designed to cherish these sectional and sectarian feelings. With a view to satisfy ourselves on the subject, we carefully examined the portions of the review here complained of, and we became convinced, that whatever may be the appearance of the passages quoted, viewed in a detached state, they do not in their connection justify the inferences which our author deduces. Yet we do not accuse him of intentional error; and if the publication were again to be made, we would not exclude a single sentence already uttered; but we would add something calculated to prevent misapprehension of our views and feelings. We would say, as we have said in another part of these remarks, that we would be unwilling to see the power possessed by the A. E. Society, in the hands of Presbyterians or any other body of men. That we would *protest and rebel against it, in whatever hands it may be lodged.*

We deeply regret this omission, because we are persuaded it would have saved the author of the Strictures the pain he evidently felt on the occasion; and us the pain of reading remarks of no common severity, and in our opinion, of no small injurious tendency.

With regard to our author's remarks on page 64, we choose to be silent. Had we been at liberty to exercise our judgment, we would, for his sake, have cancelled that page entirely. As it is, it must go; but we do not wish to aggravate the feelings it will too justly excite.

We most fully and cordially agree with our author in the following principles, viz.: "*To trust in God and do our duty*, is the only ground of hope that we have or can have, or that we need have in regard to time future." But here again we differ widely, as will be seen from the tenor of the preceding remarks, in the application of this principle to the case before us. The author's mode of carrying this principle into effect, is to accumulate large permanent funds, to establish numerous Scholarships, and to secure the return of the moneys expended into the treasury, and to *trust in God* to keep those who are to manage this concern, for ages to come, faithful in employing the means already provided, to educate indigent pious young men for the ministry of the Gospel. Our mode of carrying the same principle into effect is, to collect all the money which the Christian public is able and willing to give for the purpose, to expend it immediately in educating youth of suitable character, who cannot get an education without such aid, and to send them forth as soon as possible; (for they are all now wanted), and *to trust in God our Saviour* to be with them, according to his promise, to make their labours successful in converting sinners, hoping that by thus increasing the number of the friends of the Lord Jesus, to gain more efficient strength than if we had now a million of dollars, bearing compound interest until the end of the world. *We trust in God*, that as nations and individuals are converted to God by means of those we send to preach salvation, they will lend a helping hand, and that the impression will be indelibly fixed on the minds of each succeeding generation of Christians, that the cause of Christ is in their hands; that they must work, and not rely on the funds left by their predecessors to convert the world. The author of the Strictures has given us a homily on the evils of riches, and the blessings of poverty, to a young man. We think he might also have given us an instructive lesson, confirmed by the experience of past ages, on the dangers of large funds laid up for sacred purposes.

We confess, that after all our kind friend has said to soothe our minds, we have still "fears;" and if we may judge from words and actions, we would venture to say, our author has also "fears." But our fears arise from different causes. He seems to fear lest Christians of the next and following generations, will not be liberal; that the treasury of the Lord will be empty; and therefore he wishes to provide an accumulating fund to supply the deficiency, in case the Lord should not give future Christians benevolent hearts and liberal hands. We fear for this simple reason, lest the treasures of the A. E. Society, like the manna which the Israelites, who were unwilling to *trust the Lord* for their daily bread, hoarded up, should become corrupt. Exod. xvi. 20.

These are our general views on this subject. That there are particular cases, in which it may be wise and necessary to establish permanent funds, we are ready to admit. The only question is, whether this is the case with regard to the A. E. Society. We think not, for the reasons already stated in a former part of these remarks. The organization of this Society is such, that such funds would be peculiarly liable to perversion. They are in the hands, as before remarked, of every casual majority at any annual meeting. The temptation to abuse the trust, also, is peculiarly strong; ten fold greater than in any mere literary institution, or even theological Seminary. This Society, were its views and wishes realized, could sway the church nearly at will, and mould our ministry at pleasure. The influence which it already possesses, it is next to impossible not to exercise. We know that it is exercised by the friends and officers of its tributaries and branches; and that too, decidedly and actively. We are willing, that every man should employ his influence to promote his own views. But we are not willing to see funds and power collected and concentrated, to be used by we know not who, and for purposes that may be, and in all probability will be, hostile to the wishes of the donors of these funds, and givers of this power. We know not any one Society, in whose hands permanent funds would be so unsafe. Not from the character of its members, but from the nature of its organization. and the extent and character of its influence. These are our deliberate convictions, and it is our right and duty to express them.

The question, therefore, whether in any particular case, permanent funds are desirable, depends upon a variety of circumstances, and no general sweeping rule can be given. Our author's *argumentum ad hominem* on this subject, we do not feel, (p. 60). Admitting that there are some theological Seminaries, whose organization is peculiarly insecure, it does not prove that all are so. Besides, there is a vast difference, between an institution under a body, which *must* take its character, from that of the great majority of the Presbyterian Church; and a Society which *eleven* party men may seize and maintain; and which possesses a power, presenting the strongest possible temptation to abuse. All that our author has said on the insufficiency of creeds and confessions to secure the General Assembly, is very wide of the mark. We pretend to believe in no magic potency in such formularies; nor do we maintain that the whole church in America may not, as our author suggests, become corrupt. But we are not to be blinded by such general declamation, to the difference between the cases before us. Our author refers us to the case of the church of Scotland. We are willing to take the reference. Such is its organization, that truth and piety have retained a firmer hold upon that church, than any other in Europe. When the general blight of infidelity and indifference passed over the old world, it suffered less than any other. If its judicatories assumed, for a time, the lax character of the age; the revival of truth and piety was felt in them, as soon as it was in the churches themselves. And this is the great advantage of having societies and institutions so organized, that they are open to the influence of the churches generally. When this is the case, they are latest in feeling the influence of spreading corruption, and derive the benefit of any change for the better. But in the case of the A. E. Society, which the Author obscures by general remarks on the insecurity of worldly affairs, there is no necessity for the prevalence of any general corruption, for its becoming a party engine. We humbly conceive that there is some difference between *eleven*, (which may be a commanding majority in the A. E. Society,) and the great body of the churches. Besides, let it be considered, that it is not down right heresy alone, which would produce the evil. This we have before remarked. Our author, therefore, is greatly mistaken in supposing, that we knew not what we were about; that we unconsciously proceeded upon the assumption, that Congregationalists were heretics, and had the design of breaking down the Presbyterian church. This is no controversy between Congregationalists and Presbyterians. It is a question, whether the A. E. Society shall have the power to govern the church? Whether we are willing to submit, without a murmur, to their direction; and resign ourselves with passive confidence into their hands, on their simple assurance that they never have, and never will abuse their power? We do really hope and believe, that when our author comes to review his answer on this subject, he will feel it has not touched the point. And we believe also, that the churches are not to be blinded by any such general appeal, as that in which our author has here indulged. We as Presbyterians have no jealousies about the Congregationalists as such. We are willing and desirous of living and acting with them, in peace and brotherhood. But we are not to be governed by them: nor by the A. E. Society, even should it, as the author predicts, become a Presbyterian institution. We should be as little willing to submit to it then, as now.

We are sincerely sorry, that we feel constrained to assume the character of opposers of any benevolent association. Nothing but a deep and pressing sense of duty, could constrain us to take such a step. But we feel convinced, more now than ever, that the organization and principles of this Society, threaten the church with a vassalage, which we are bound to resist. Were it confined to New England, we should have remained silent. But when we see, within our own borders, a Society, acting upon principles, which we deem of serious and lasting evil tendency, and attaining a power over our ministers and churches, which no set of men on earth ought to possess, it would be treason to ourselves and to the cause of our Master, not to speak. Our author has answered no one of our objections; he has not even weakened their force. He will, therefore, be sadly disappointed in his expectation, that we would entirely withdraw them. We have no disposition to dictate to others. Let the Christian public read, and act for themselves. If they view this whole subject in a different light from that in which it strikes our minds; then let them patronize the A. E. Society, but if they think with us, let them secure themselves against the evils to which we have referred, or withdraw from it their confidence. We rejoice in the assurance, that the Lord reigneth. He will overrule all things to the good of his cause. Fully conscious of the purity of our motives, and convinced of the justness and weight of our objections, we cannot regret the course which we have taken.

If there is any thing in our remarks, which "bears hardly" on our author; we hope he will consider that "it results from necessity, not from choice." We were obliged to show how far his arguments were from reaching the point, and how little we were disposed to take dicta for proof.

As to the mere mode of reference to the distinguished gentleman, who wrote the article on which we have remarked, we would state, that the request to have his name attached to it, was received after two thirds of our reply was written, and part of it in the printer's hands.

Date Due

LC564 .A5A7
Articles on the American education
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00004 1741